arXiv:1511.04804v3 [math.CA] 27 Nov 2015

Finiteness Principles for Smooth Selection

Charles Fefferman, Arie Israel, Garving K. Luli *

November 30, 2015

Introduction

In this paper, we extend a basic finiteness principle [6, 10], used in [15, 16] to fit smooth functions F to data. Our results raise the hope that one can start to understand constrained interpolation problems in which e.g. the interpolating function F is required to be nonnegative everywhere.

Let us set up notation. We fix positive integers m, n, D. We will work with the function spaces $C^m(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)$ and $C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)$ and their norms $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)}$ and $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)}$. Here, $C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ denotes the space of all functions $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^D$ whose derivatives $\partial^\beta F$ (for all $|\beta| \leq m$) are continuous and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ denotes the space of all $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^D$ whose derivatives $\partial^\beta F$ (for all $|\beta| \leq m-1$) are bounded and Lipschitz on $\mathbb{R}^n$. When $D = 1$, we write $C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in place of $C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ and $C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$.

Expressions $c(m, n)$, $C(m, n)$, $k(m, n)$, etc. denote constants depending only on m, n; these expressions may denote different constants in different occurrences. Similar conventions apply to constants denoted by $C(m, n, D)$, $k(D)$, etc.

If X is any finite set, then $\#(X)$ denotes the number of elements in X.

We recall the basic finiteness principle of [10].

*The first author is supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1265524, AFOSR grant FA9550-12-1-0425, and Grant No 2014055 from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF). The third author is supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1355968 and a start-up fund from UC Davis.

Theorem 1 *For large enough* $k^{\#} = k(m,n)$ *and* $C^{\#} = C(m,n)$ *the following hold:*

(A) C^m **FLAVOR** *Let* $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ *with* $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *finite. Suppose that for each* $S \subset E$ *with* $\#(S) \le k^{\#}$ *there exists* $F^S \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with norm* $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le 1$*, such that* $F^S = f$ *on* S*. Then there exists* $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with norm* $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C^{\#}$*, such that* $F = f$ *on* E*.*

(B) $C^{m-1,1}$ **FLAVOR** *Let* $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ *with* $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *arbitrary. Suppose that for each* $S \subset E$ *with* $\#(S) \le k^{\#}$*, there exists* $F^S \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with norm* $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le 1$*, such that* $F^S = f$ *on* S*. Then there exists* $F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with norm* $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C^{\#}$*, such that* $F = f$ *on* E*.*

Theorem 1 and several related results were conjectured by Y. Brudnyi and P. Shvartsman in [5] and [6] (see also [23–25]). The first nontrivial case $m = 2$ with the sharp "finiteness constant" $k^{\#} = 3 \cdot 2^{n-1}$ was proven by P. Shvartsman [22,25]; see also [9,23]. The proof of Theorem 1 for general m, n appears in [10]. For general m, n, the optimal $k^{\#}$ is unknown, but see [1,30].

The proof [23,25] of Theorem 1 for $m = 2$ was based on a generalization of the following "finiteness principle for Lipschitz selection" [24] for maps of metric spaces.

Theorem 2 *For large enough* $k^{\#} = k^{\#}(D)$ *and* $C^{\#} = C^{\#}(D)$*, the following holds.*
Let X *be a metric space. For each* $x \in X$*, let* $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ *be an affine subspace in* $\mathbb{R}^D$ *of dimension* $\le d$*. Suppose that for each* $S \subset X$ *with* $\#(S) \le k^{\#}$ *there exists a map* $F^S : S \to \mathbb{R}^D$ *with Lipschitz constant* ≤ 1*, such that* $F^S(x) \in K(x)$ *for all* $x \in S$*.*
Then there exists a map $F : X \to \mathbb{R}^D$ *with Lipschitz constant* $\le C^{\#}$*, such that* $F(x) \in K(x)$ *for all* $x \in X$*.*

In fact, P. Shvartsman in [24] showed that one can take $k^{\#} = 2^{d+1}$ in Theorem 2 and that the constant $k^{\#} = 2^{d+1}$ is sharp, see [26].

P. Shvartsman also showed that Theorem 2 remains valid when $\mathbb{R}^D$ is replaced by a Hilbert space (see [27]) or a Banach space (see [29]).

It is conjectured in [6] that Theorem 2 should hold for any compact convex subsets $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$. In [28], P. Shvartsman provided evidence for this conjecture: He showed that the conjecture holds in the case when $D = 2$ and

in the case when X is a finite metric space and the constant $C^{\#}$ is allowed to depend on the cardinality of X.

In this paper we prove finiteness principles for $C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$-selection, and for $C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$-selection, in particular providing a proof for the conjecture in [6] for the case $X = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 3 *For large enough $k^{\#} = k(m, n, D)$ and $C^{\#} = C(m, n, D)$, the following hold.*

(A) C^m FLAVOR *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be finite. For each $x \in E$, let $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ be convex. Suppose that for each $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$, there exists $F^S \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ with norm $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)} \leq 1$, such that $F^S(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in S$.*
Then there exists $F \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ with norm $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C^{\#}$, such that $F(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in E$.

(B) $C^{m-1,1}$ FLAVOR *For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ be a closed convex set. Suppose that for each $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$, there exists $F^S \in C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ with norm $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)} \leq 1$, such that $F^S(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in S$.*
Then there exists $F \in C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ with norm $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C^{\#}$, such that $F(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

We also prove a closely related result on interpolation by nonnegative functions.

Theorem 4 *For large enough $k^{\#} = k(m, n)$ and $C^{\#} = C(m, n)$ the following hold.*

(A) C^m FLAVOR *Let $f : E \to [0, \infty)$ with $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ finite. Suppose that for each $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$, there exists $F^S \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$, such that $F^S = f$ on S and $F^S \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*
Then there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C^{\#}$, such that $F = f$ on E and $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(B) $C^{m-1,1}$ FLAVOR *Let $f : E \to [0, \infty)$ with $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ arbitrary. Suppose that for each $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$, there exists $F^S \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$, such that $F^S = f$ on S and $F^S \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*
Then there exists $F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C^{\#}$, such that $F = f$ on E and $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

One might wonder how to decide whether the relevant F^s exist in the above results. This issue is addressed in [10] for Theorem 1; and in Sections III.4, III.5 below for Theorems 3 and 4.

A weaker version of the case $D = 1$ of Theorem 3 appears in [10]. There, each $K(x)$ is an interval $[f(x) - \varepsilon(x), f(x) + \varepsilon(x)]$. In place of the conclusion $F(x) \in K(x)$ in Theorem 3, [10] obtains the weaker conclusion $F(x) \in [f(x) - C\varepsilon(x), f(x) + C\varepsilon(x)]$ for a constant C determined by m, n.

Our interest in Theorems 3 and 4 arises in part from their possible connection to the interpolation algorithms of Fefferman-Klartag [15, 16]. Given a function $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ with $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ finite, the goal of [15, 16] is to compute a function $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $F = f$ on E, with norm $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ as small as possible up to a factor $C(m, n)$. Roughly speaking, the algorithm in [15,16] computes such an F using $O(N \log N)$ computer operations, where $N = \#(E)$. The algorithm is based on ideas from the proof [10] of Theorem 1. Accordingly, Theorems 3 and 4 raise the hope that we can start to understand constrained interpolation problems, in which e.g. the interpolant F is constrained to be nonnegative everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorems 3 and 4 follow from a more general result – Theorem 6 below – which is the real content of this paper. To arrive at the statement of Theorem 6, we first recall some ideas from the proof of Theorem 1 in [10]. Next, we formulate the main definitions, namely that of a "shape field" and that of "$(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convexity". Finally, we state Theorem 6, say a few words about its proof, and explain its relationship with Theorems 3 and 4.

We will need a bit more notation. For $F \in C^{m-1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $J_x(F)$ (the "jet" of F at x) to denote the $(m-1)^{rst}$ degree Taylor polynomial of F at x, i.e.,

$$[J_x(F)](y) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (\partial^\alpha F(x)) \cdot (y - x)^\alpha \text{ for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Thus, $J_x(F)$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}$, the vector space of all real-valued polynomials of degree at most $(m-1)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there is a natural multiplication $\odot_x$ on $\mathcal{P}$ ("multiplication of jets at x"), uniquely specified by demanding that

$$J_x(FG) = J_x(F) \odot_x J_x(G)$$

for $F, G \in C^{m-1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. More explicitly,

$$P \odot_x Q = J_x(PQ)$$

for $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$.

We now present the ideas from the proof of Theorem 1 that will form the background for the statement of Theorem 6. We pose a key question:

Let $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ *with* $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *finite, and let* $M > 0$. *Suppose that* $F = f$ *on* E *and* $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M$. *What can we say about* $J_x(F)$ *for a given* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$*?*

Although the question makes sense for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we restrict ourselves here to $x \in E$. We define the (possibly empty) convex set

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad \Gamma(x, M) &= \left\{ J_x(F) : F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n), \|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M, F = f \text{ on } E \right\} \\ &\subset \mathcal{P} \end{aligned}$$

and undertake to compute its approximate size and shape.

The set $\Gamma(x, M)$ carries a lot of information. Already the mere assertion that $\Gamma(x_0, M_0)$ is non-empty for a particular x_0, M_0 tells us that there exists an interpolant with C^m-norm $\leq M_0$. Once we compute the approximate size and shape of the $\Gamma(x, M)$, Theorem 1 will follow easily.

To understand $\Gamma(x, M)$, we first define the (possibly empty) convex set

$$(2) \quad \Gamma_0(x, M) = \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P} : \left| \partial^\beta P(x) \right| \leq M \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m - 1, P(x) = f(x) \right\},$$

for $x \in E$, $M > 0$.

Trivially, $\Gamma_0(x, M) \supset \Gamma(x, M)$ for all $x \in E$, $M > 0$; most likely, $\Gamma_0(x, M)$ is much bigger than $\Gamma(x, M)$. To remedy this, we pass from $\Gamma_0(x, M)$ to smaller sets $\Gamma_l(x, M)$, by induction on l. Each $\Gamma_l(x, M)$ ($x \in E, M > 0, l \geq 0$) will be a (possibly empty) convex subset of $\mathcal{P}$. Our $\Gamma_l(x, M)$ will decrease with l, but we will still have

$$(3) \qquad \Gamma_l(x, M) \supset \Gamma(x, M) \text{ for all } x \in E, M > 0.$$

We pass from Γ_l to Γ_{l+1} as follows.

Let $x \in E$, $M > 0$, $l \geq 0$. Then $\Gamma_{l+1}(x, M)$ consists of all $P \in \Gamma_l(x, M)$ such that for each $y \in E$ there exists $P' \in \Gamma_l(y, M)$ such that

$$(4) \qquad \left| \partial^\beta (P - P')(x) \right| \leq C(m, n) M |x - y|^{m - |\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m - 1.$$

(Compare with the "pedagogical algorithm" in [15].)

Evidently, $\Gamma_{l+1}(x, M) \subset \Gamma_l(x, M)$; the $\Gamma_l(x, M)$ decrease with l, as promised.

Moreover, if (3) holds for a given l, then

$$(5) \qquad \Gamma_{l+1}(x, M) \supset \Gamma(x, M) \text{ for all } x \in E, M > 0.$$

Indeed, suppose $P \in \Gamma(x, M)$. By definition, there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M$, such that $F = f$ on E and $J_x(F) = P$.

Let $y \in E$, and set $P' = J_y(F)$. By definition, $P' \in \Gamma(y, M)$; hence, $P' \in \Gamma_l(y, M)$; by (3). Moreover, (4) holds, thanks to Taylor's theorem. Thus, for every $y \in E$ we have found a $P' \in \Gamma_l(y, M)$ that satisfies (4). This means that $P \in \Gamma_{l+1}(x, M)$, completing the proof of (5).

We now know by induction that (3) holds for all $l \geq 0$.

The following result computes the approximate size and shape of the $\Gamma(x, M)$.

Theorem 5 *For a large enough* $l_* = l_*(m, n)$ *and* $C_* = C_*(m, n)$*, we have*

$$\Gamma(x, M) \subset \Gamma_{l_*}(x, M) \subset \Gamma(x, C_* M).$$

Once we know Theorem 5, we bring in Helly's theorem [21] to complete the proof of Theorem 1 (in the C^m FLAVOR). We recall

Helly's Theorem Let $K_1, \cdots, K_N$ be convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^D$. If any $(D+1)$ of the sets $K_1, \cdots, K_N$ have a point in common, then $K_1, \cdots, K_N$ have a point in common.

This elementary result is clearly relevant to Theorem 1.

To exploit Helly's theorem, we define

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(x, M, S) = \left\{ J_x(F) : F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n), \|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M, F = f \text{ on } S \right\}, \text{ for } S \subset E,$$

and then set

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_l(x, M) = \bigcap_{S \subset E, \#(S) \leq (2+\dim \mathcal{P})^l} \tilde{\Gamma}(x, M, S).$$

Suppose that $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

($\star$) For each $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$ there exists $F^S \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M$ such that $F^S = f$ on S.

If $k^{\#} \geq (2 + \dim \mathcal{P})^{l+1}$, then an easy argument using Helly's theorem shows that $\tilde{\Gamma}_l(x, M)$ is nonempty. Also, an easy induction on l, again using Helly's theorem, shows that $\tilde{\Gamma}_l(x, M) \subset \Gamma_l(x, M)$ for all $l \geq 0$.

Now let l_* be as in Theorem 5, and suppose ($\star$) holds with $k^{\#} \geq (2 + \dim \mathcal{P})^{l_*+1}$. Then $\tilde{\Gamma}_{l_*}(x, M)$ is nonempty, hence $\Gamma_{l_*}(x, M)$ is nonempty. Theorem 5 now tells us that $\Gamma(x, C_* M)$ is non-empty, which means that

($\star\star$) There exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with norm $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_* M$ such that $F = f$ on E.

Thus, ($\star$) implies ($\star\star$), which is the content of the C^m FLAVOR of Theorem 1.

The $C^{m-1,1}$ FLAVOR of Theorem 1 follows easily. This completes our discussion of Theorem 1.

Motivated by the above discussion, we define a key notion, preparing for the statement of Theorem 6. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be finite. A shape field on E is a family $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ of (possibly empty) convex sets $\Gamma(x, M) \subset \mathcal{P}$, indexed by $x \in E$ and $M > 0$, with the property that $M' < M$ implies $\Gamma(x, M') \subset \Gamma(x, M)$ for any x, M, M'.

Note that finiteness of E is part of the definition of a shape field.

Our goal is to give an analogue of Theorem 5 starting from a shape field $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ much more general than that given by (2).

Instead of seeking functions $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $F = f$ on E, we will now be seeking functions $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $J_x(F) \in \Gamma_0(x, CM)$ for all $x \in E$. In the context of Theorem 5 with $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ given by (2), this is consistent with our previous discussion.

We can pass from $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ to its "l^{th}-refinement" $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ for $l = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$ by the same rule as before:

$\Gamma_{l+1}(x, M)$ consists of all $P \in \Gamma_l(x, M)$ such that for each $y \in E$ there exists $P' \in \Gamma_l(y, M)$ such that $\left|\partial^\beta (P - P')(x)\right| \leq M|x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

We will need a hypothesis on $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ called $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convexity. This notion is a bit technical.[1] To motivate it, we anticipate a situation that arises in the proof of Theorem 6.

We will be trying to produce a function $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (with control on its derivatives up to m^{th} order), such that

(P1) $J_x(F) \in \Gamma_0(x, CM)$ for all $x \in E \cap Q_{\max}$, where $Q_{\max}$ is a cube of sidelength $\delta_{\max}$.

The cube $Q_{\max}$ will be partitioned into Calderón-Zygmund cubes Q_ν with sidelengths $\delta_\nu \leq \delta_{\max}$. We will introduce a partition of unity

[1] The reader may prefer to skip over the definition of $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convexity on first reading.

(P2) $1 = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu^2$ on $Q_{\max}$,

adapted to the Calderón-Zygmund cubes Q_ν. More precisely, for each ν,

(P3) θ_ν is supported in the double of Q_ν, with estimates $\left|\partial^\beta \theta_\nu\right| \leq C\delta_\nu^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m$.

For each Q_ν, we will produce a local solution F_ν such that

(P4) $J_x(F_\nu) \in \Gamma_0(x, M)$ for all $x \in E \cap Q_\nu$, with control on the derivatives of F_ν up to order m.

Moreover, the F_ν agree with one another, in the sense that

(P5) $\left|\partial^\beta (F_\nu - F_{\nu'})\right| \leq CM\delta_\nu^{m-|\beta|}$ on $Q_\nu \cap Q_{\nu'}$, for $|\beta| \leq m$.

Conditions (P2), (P3), (P5) are familiar from the classical proof [32] of the Whitney extension theorem. As in that proof, we patch together our local solutions F_ν by setting

(P6) $F = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu^2 F_\nu$.

We hope that conditions (P2)$\cdots$(P5) will guarantee that the function F given by (P6) will satisfy (P1).

The above discussion motivates the following definitions, where P_ν, Q_ν play the rôles of $J_x(F_\nu)$, $J_x(\theta_\nu)$ respectively, for a given $x \in E \cap Q_{\max}$.

Let $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ be a shape field. Let C_w, $\delta_{\max} > 0$ be given.

Definition *We say that $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ is $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convex if the following holds: Suppose $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$; $x \in E$; $M > 0$; $P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma_0(x, M)$; $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}$. Assume the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial^\beta (P_1 - P_2)(x)\right| &\leq M\delta^{m-|\beta|}, \\ \left|\partial^\beta Q_1(x)\right| &\leq \delta^{-|\beta|}, \\ \left|\partial^\beta Q_2(x)\right| &\leq \delta^{-|\beta|}, \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m-1. \end{aligned}$$

Assume also that $Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 = 1$.

Then $Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 \odot_x P_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 \odot_x P_2 \in \Gamma_0(x, C_w M)$.

This notion is a close relative of "Whitney convexity" in [11], and our Theorem 6 below generalizes the main results of [11].

Theorem 6 *For a large enough* $l_* = l_*(m,n)$*, the following holds. Let* $\Gamma_0 = (\Gamma_0(x,M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ *be a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field, and for* $l \geq 1$*, let* $\Gamma_l = (\Gamma_l(x,M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ *be its* l^{th} *refinement. Suppose we are given a cube* $Q_{\max}$ *of sidelength* $\delta_{\max}$*, a point* $x_0 \in E \cap Q_{\max}$*, a number* $M_0 > 0$*, and a polynomial* $P_0 \in \Gamma_{l_*}(x_0, M_0)$*. Then there exists* $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *such that*

- $J_x(F) \in \Gamma_0(x, C_* M_0)$ *for all* $x \in Q_{\max} \cap E$*, and*
- $|\partial^\beta (F - P_0)(x)| \leq C_* M_0 \delta_{\max}^{m-|\beta|}$ *for all* $x \in Q_{\max}$*,* $|\beta| \leq m$*.*

Here, C_* *depends only on* m*,* n*,* C_w*.*

Just as Theorem 5 implies Theorem 1, our Theorem 6 implies the following finiteness principle for shape fields.

Theorem 7 *For a large enough* $k^\# = k(m,n)$ *the following holds. Let* $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x,M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ *be a* $(C_w, 1)$*-convex shape field. Let* $M_0 > 0$*. Suppose that for each* $S \subset E$ *with* $\#(S) \leq k^\#$*, there exists* $F^S \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with norm* $\|F^S\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M_0$*, such that* $J_x(F^S) \in \Gamma_0(x, M_0)$ *for all* $x \in S$*. Then there exists* $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with norm* $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_* M_0$*, such that* $J_x(F) \in \Gamma_0(x, C_* M_0)$ *for all* $x \in E$*. Here,* C_* *depends only on* m*,* n*,* C_w*.*

Once we know Theorem 7, it is relatively straightforward to deduce Theorems 3 and 4. To deduce Theorem 3 (in the C^m FLAVOR), we introduce a new variable $\xi = (\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_D) \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Given $(K(x))_{x\in E}$ as in Theorem 3 (A), we set $E^+ = E \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^D$. To find functions $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^D$ such that $F(x) \in K(x)$ for $x \in E$, we look for functions $\mathcal{F}(x,\xi)$ mapping $\mathbb{R}^{n+D}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathcal{F}(x,0) = 0$ and $\nabla_\xi \mathcal{F}(x,0) \in K(x)$ for all $(x,0) \in E^+$; compare with Fefferman-Luli [17]. Theorem 7 then allows us to find such an $\mathcal{F} \in C^{m+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+D}\right)$. Setting $F(x) = \nabla_\xi \mathcal{F}(x,0)$, we obtain Theorem 3 in the C^m FLAVOR. The $C^{m-1,1}$ FLAVOR then follows easily.

Theorem 4 (B) is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3 (B); in the latter theorem, we take $D = 1$ and set $K(x) = \{f(x)\}$ for $x \in E$, $K(x) = [0,\infty)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$.

We omit from this introduction the derivation of Theorem 4 (A) from Theorem 6.

We give a brief sketch of the proof of Theorem 6, sacrificing accuracy for simplicity; see the later sections of this paper for correct details.

We adapt from [13] the key idea of an "$\mathcal{A}$-basis". To formulate this notion, we introduce notation and definitions.

We write $\mathcal{M}$ to denote the set of all multiindices $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ of order $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n \leq m - 1$. We denote subsets of $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{A}'$, etc. A subset $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}$ will be called "monotonic" if, for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$, $\alpha + \gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ implies $\alpha + \gamma \in \mathcal{A}$. We use the total order relation $<$ on subsets of $\mathcal{M}$ defined in [10]. With respect to this order relation $\mathcal{M}$ itself is the minimal subset of $\mathcal{M}$, and the empty set $\emptyset$ is the maximal subset.

Now suppose $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ is a shape field. Let $x_0 \in E$, $M_0 > 0$, $P_0 \in \Gamma(x_0, M_0)$ be given. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be monotonic, and let $C_B, \delta > 0$ be real numbers. Then we say that $\vec{\Gamma}$ has an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis at (x_0, M_0, P_0) if there exist polynomials $P_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ with the following properties:

- $\partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ (Kronecker delta) for all $\beta, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.
- $\left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0)\right| \leq C_B \delta^{|\alpha| - |\beta|}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.
- $P_0 + \tau M_0 \delta^{m - |\alpha|} P_\alpha \in \Gamma(x_0, C_B M_0)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $|\tau| \leq \frac{1}{C_B}$.

Note that for $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$, $\vec{\Gamma}$ always has an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis at (x_0, M_0, P_0), since the desired list of polynomials $(P_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is then empty.

By induction on the monotonic set $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to the order $<$, we will prove the following result. We write δ_Q to denote the sidelength of a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 1 (Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$) *Let $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ be a $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convex shape field, with l-th refinement $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ (each $l \geq 0$). Let $Q_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a cube with sidelength $\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$, and let $x_0 \in E \cap Q_0$, $M_0 > 0$, $P_0 \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})}(x_0, M_0)$ for a suitable $l(\mathcal{A})$ determined by $\mathcal{A}$, m, n. Assume $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})}$ has an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta_{Q_0}, C_B)$-basis at (x_0, M_0, P_0). Then there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that*

$$\left|\partial^\beta (F - P_0)(x)\right| \leq C_* M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m - |\beta|} \text{ for } x \in Q_0, |\beta| \leq m; \tag{6}$$

and

$$J_x(F) \in \Gamma_0(x, C_* M_0) \text{ for all } x \in E \cap Q_0. \tag{7}$$

Here, C_* depends only on C_B, C_w, m, n.

Theorem 6 follows at once from the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ (the empty set), since there is always a $(\emptyset, \delta_{Q_0}, C_B)$-basis at (x_0, M_0, P_0), where (say) $C_B = 1$. Thus, our task is to establish the above Main Lemma by induction on $\mathcal{A}$.

The base case of our induction is the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{M}$. In this case, one can just set $F = P_0$. Then (6) holds trivially, and we can show that (7) holds as well.

For the induction step, we fix a monotonic $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}$ ($\mathcal{A} \neq \mathcal{M}$), and suppose that the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}'$ is valid for all $\mathcal{A}' < \mathcal{A}$. We will then prove the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$.

Suppose $\vec{\Gamma}_l$, x_0, M_0, P_0, Q_0 etc. are as in the hypotheses of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$. We must find a function $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying (6) and (7).

We will make a Calderón-Zygmund decomposition of Q_0 into subcubes $\{Q_\nu\}$. Some of the Q_ν may have empty intersection with E, but in this expository discussion we pretend that we can pick $x_\nu \in E \cap Q_\nu$ for each ν. We write $\frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$ to denote the cube obtained by dilating Q_ν about its center by a factor $\frac{65}{64}$. For each Q_ν, we will carefully pick $\mathcal{A}'_\nu < \mathcal{A}$ monotonic, and $P_\nu \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A}'_\nu)}(x_\nu, CM_0)$, such that

$$\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A}'_\nu)} \text{ has an } \left(\mathcal{A}'_\nu, \delta_{\frac{65}{64}Q_\nu}, C'\right)\text{-basis at } (x_\nu, M_0, P_\nu). \tag{8}$$

Since $\mathcal{A}'_\nu < \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'_\nu$ is monotonic, our induction hypothesis applies; thus, the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}'_\nu$ is valid. Therefore, by (8), there exists $F_\nu \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\left|\partial^\beta (F_\nu - P_\nu)(x)\right| \leq C_* M_0 \delta_{Q_\nu}^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu,\ |\beta| \leq m, \tag{9}$$

and

$$J_x(F_\nu) \in \Gamma_0(x, CM) \text{ for } x \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu. \tag{10}$$

We patch together the local solutions F_ν into an $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as in (P1)$\cdots$(P5) above. By picking the above P_ν with great care, we can arrange that

$$\left|\partial^\beta (P_\nu - P_{\nu'})(x)\right| \leq CM_0 \delta_{Q_\nu}^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_{\nu'}, |\beta| \leq m.$$

Consequently, estimate (9) implies the crucial consistency condition (P5). Thus, our θ_ν and F_ν satisfy (P2)$\cdots$(P5). The $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convexity of $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ now implies that the function F given by (P5) satisfies

$$J_x(F) \in \Gamma_0(x, CM_0) \text{ for all } x \in E \cap Q_0. \tag{11}$$

Moreover, Whitney's classic argument [32] yields the estimate

$$\left|\partial^\beta (F - P_0)(x)\right| \leq CM_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } x \in Q_0,\ |\beta| \leq m. \tag{12}$$

Our results (11), (12) are precisely the conclusions of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$.

This completes our induction on $\mathcal{A}$, proving the Main Lemma for all monotonic $\mathcal{A}$, and consequently establishing Theorems 3, 4, 6, 7 as explained above.

Our Main Lemma and its proof are analogous to the main ideas in [10,12, 13]. However, at one crucial point (Case 2 in the proof of Lemma 16 below), the analogy breaks down, and we are saved from disaster by a lucky accident.

This concludes our summary of the proof of Theorem 6. We again warn the reader that it is oversimplified. In the following sections, we start from scratch and provide correct proofs.

This paper is part of a literature on extension, interpolation, and selection of functions, going back to H. Whitney's seminal work [32], and including fundamental contributions by G. Glaeser [18], Y, Brudnyi and P. Shvartsman [4,6–9,22–30], J. Wells [31], E. Le Gruyer [20], and E. Bierstone, P. Milman, and W. Pawłucki [1–3], as well as our own papers [10, 12–17]. See e.g. [14] for the history of the problem, as well as Zobin [33,34] for a related problem.

We are grateful to the American Institute of Mathematics, the Banff International Research Station, the Fields Institute, and the College of William and Mary for hosting workshops on interpolation and extension. We are grateful also to the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Naval Research for financial support.

We are also grateful to Pavel Shvartsman and Alex Brudnyi for their comments on an earlier version of our manuscript, and to all the participants of the Eighth Whitney Problems Workshop for their interest in our work.

Part I
Shape Fields and Their Refinements

I.1 Notation and Preliminaries

Fix $m, n \geq 1$. We will work with cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$; all our cubes have sides parallel to the coordinate axes. If Q is a cube, then δ_Q denotes the sidelength of Q. For real numbers $A > 0$, AQ denotes the cube whose center is that of Q, and whose sidelength is $A\delta_Q$.

A dyadic cube is a cube of the form $I_1 \times I_2 \times \cdots \times I_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where each I_ν has the form $[2^k \cdot i_\nu, 2^k \cdot (i_\nu + 1))$ for integers $i_1, \cdots, i_n, k$. Each dyadic cube Q is contained in one and only one dyadic cube with sidelength $2\delta_Q$; that cube is denoted by Q^+.

We write $\mathcal{P}$ to denote the vector space of all real-valued polynomials of degree at most $(m-1)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and F is a real-valued C^{m-1} function on a neighborhood of x, then $J_x(F)$ (the "jet" of F at x) denotes the $(m-1)^{\text{rst}}$ order Taylor polynomial of F at x, i.e.,

$$J_x(F)(y) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \partial^\alpha F(x) \cdot (y-x)^\alpha .$$

Thus, $J_x(F) \in \mathcal{P}$.

For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there is a natural multiplication $\odot_x$ on $\mathcal{P}$ ("multiplication of jets at x") defined by setting

$$P \odot_x Q = J_x(PQ) \text{ for } P, Q \in \mathcal{P}.$$

We write $C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to denote the Banach space of real-valued locally C^m functions F on $\mathbb{R}^n$ for which the norm

$$\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \max_{|\alpha| \leq m} |\partial^\alpha F(x)|$$

is finite. Similarly, for $D \geq 1$, we write $C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ to denote the Banach

space of all $\mathbb{R}^D$-valued locally C^m functions F on $\mathbb{R}^n$, for which the norm

$$\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} \max_{|\alpha|\leq m} \|\partial^\alpha F(x)\|$$

is finite. Here, we use the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^D$.

If F is a real-valued function on a cube Q, then we write $F \in C^m(Q)$ to denote that F and its derivatives up to m-th order extend continuously to the closure of Q. For $F \in C^m(Q)$, we define

$$\|F\|_{C^m(Q)} = \sup_{x\in Q} \max_{|\alpha|\leq m} |\partial^\alpha F(x)| .$$

Similarly, if F is an $\mathbb{R}^D$-valued function on a cube Q, then we write $F \in C^m\left(Q,\mathbb{R}^D\right)$ to denote that F and its derivatives up to m-th order extend continuously to the closure of Q. For $F \in C^m\left(Q,\mathbb{R}^D\right)$, we define

$$\|F\|_{C^m(Q,\mathbb{R}^D)} = \sup_{x\in Q} \max_{|\alpha|\leq m} \|\partial^\alpha F(x)\| ,$$

where again we use the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^D$.

If $F \in C^m(Q)$ and x belongs to the boundary of Q, then we still write $J_x(F)$ to denote the $(m-1)^{rst}$ degree Taylor polynomial of F at x, even though F isn't defined on a full neighborhood of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be non-empty and finite. A Whitney field on S is a family of polynomials

$$\vec{P} = \left(P^y\right)_{y\in S} \ \text{(each } P^y \in \mathcal{P}),$$

parametrized by the points of S.

We write $\mathcal{Wh}(S)$ to denote the vector space of all Whitney fields on S.

For $\vec{P} = \left(P^y\right)_{y\in S} \in \mathcal{Wh}(S)$, we define the seminorm

$$\left\|\vec{P}\right\|_{\dot{C}^m(S)} = \max_{x,y\in S,(x\neq y),|\alpha|\leq m} \frac{\left|\partial^\alpha\left(P^x - P^y\right)(x)\right|}{|x-y|^{m-|\alpha|}}.$$

(If S consists of a single point, then $\left\|\vec{P}\right\|_{\dot{C}^m(S)} = 0$.)

We write $\mathcal{M}$ to denote the set of all multiindices $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ of order $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n \leq m-1$.

We define a (total) order relation $<$ on $\mathcal{M}$, as follows. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n)$ be distinct elements of $\mathcal{M}$. Pick the largest k for which $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_k \neq \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_k$. (There must be at least one such k, since α and β are distinct). Then we say that $\alpha < \beta$ if $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_k < \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_k$.

We also define a (total) order relation $<$ on subsets of $\mathcal{M}$, as follows. Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ be distinct subsets of $\mathcal{M}$, and let γ be the least element of the symmetric difference $(\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}) \cup (\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A})$ (under the above order on the elements of $\mathcal{M}$). Then we say that $\mathcal{A} < \mathcal{B}$ if $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$.

One checks easily that the above relations $<$ are indeed total order relations. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ is minimal, and the empty set $\emptyset$ is maximal under $<$. A set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is called <u>monotonic</u> if, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$, $\alpha + \gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ implies $\alpha + \gamma \in \mathcal{A}$. We make repeated use of a simple observation:

Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is monotonic, $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If $\partial^\alpha P(x_0) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\partial^\alpha P \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

This follows by writing $\partial^\alpha P(y) = \sum_{|\gamma| \leq m-1-|\alpha|} \frac{1}{\gamma!} \partial^{\alpha+\gamma} P(x_0) \cdot (y - x_0)^\gamma$ and noting that all the relevant $\alpha + \gamma$ belong to $\mathcal{A}$, hence $\partial^{\alpha+\gamma} P(x_0) = 0$.

We need a few elementary facts about convex sets. We recall

Helly's Theorem *Let $K_1, \cdots, K_N \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ be convex. Suppose that $K_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap K_{i_{D+1}}$ is nonempty for any $i_1, \cdots, i_{D+1} \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$. Then $K_1 \cap \cdots \cap K_N$ is nonempty.*

See [21].

We also use the following

Trivial Remark on Convex Sets *Let Γ be a convex set, and let P_0, $P_0 + P_\nu$, $P_0 - P_\nu \in \Gamma$ for $\nu = 1, \cdots, \nu_{max}$. Then for any real numbers $t_1, \cdots, t_{\nu_{max}}$ with*

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\nu_{max}} |t_\nu| \leq 1,$$

we have

$$P_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\nu_{max}} t_\nu P_\nu \in \Gamma.$$

To see this, we write each $t_\nu = \sigma_\nu |t_\nu|$ with $\sigma_\nu \in \{-1, 1\}$. Then

$$P_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\nu_{\max}} t_\nu P_\nu = \sum_{\nu=1}^{\nu_{\max}} |t_\nu| \cdot (P_0 + \sigma_\nu P_\nu) + \left[1 - \sum_{\nu=1}^{\nu_{\max}} |t_\nu|\right] \cdot (P_0) .$$

The right-hand side is a convex combination of vectors in Γ, proving the trivial remark.

For finite sets X, we write $\#(X)$ to denote the numbers of elements in X.

If $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ is an n-tuple of positive real numbers, and if $\beta = (\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, then we write λ^β to denote

$$\lambda_1^{\beta_1} \cdots \lambda_n^{\beta_n}.$$

We write $B_n(x, r)$ to denote the open ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with center x and radius r, with respect to the Euclidean metric.

I.2 Shape Fields

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be finite. For each $x \in E$, $M \in (0, \infty)$, let $\Gamma(x, M) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be a (possibly empty) convex set. We say that $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ is a shape field if for all $x \in E$ and $0 < M' \leq M < \infty$, we have

$$\Gamma(x, M') \subseteq \Gamma(x, M) .$$

Let $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ be a shape field and let $C_w, \delta_{\max}$ be positive real numbers. We say that $\vec{\Gamma}$ is $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convex if the following condition holds:

Let $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$, $x \in E$, $M \in (0, \infty)$, P_1, P_2, Q_1, $Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}$. Assume that

(1) $P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma(x, M)$;

(2) $|\partial^\beta (P_1 - P_2)(x)| \leq M \delta^{m - |\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m - 1$;

(3) $|\partial^\beta Q_i(x)| \leq \delta^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m - 1$ for $i = 1, 2$;

(4) $Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 = 1$.

Then

(5) $P := Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 \odot_x P_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 \odot_x P_2 \in \Gamma(x, C_w M)$.

Lemma 2 *Suppose* $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M>0}$ *is a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field. Let*

(6) $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$, $x \in E$, $M > 0$, $P_1, P_2, Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ *and* $A', A'' > 0$.

Assume that

(7) $P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma(x, A'M)$;

(8) $\left|\partial^\beta (P_1 - P_2)(x)\right| \leq A'M\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $|\beta| \leq m-1$;

(9) $\left|\partial^\beta Q_i(x)\right| \leq A''\delta^{-|\beta|}$ *for* $|\beta| \leq m-1$ *and* $i = 1, 2$;

(10) $Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 = 1$.

Then

(11) $P := Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 \odot_x P_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 \odot_x P_2 \in \Gamma(x, CM)$ *with* C *determined by* A', A'', C_w, m, *and* n.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $A', A'' \geq 1$. We simply apply the definition of $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convexity, with M, δ (in the definition) replaced by $[A' \cdot (A'')^m \cdot M]$ and $[\frac{\delta}{A''}]$, respectively. Note that $|Q_i(x)| \leq 1$ by (10), and $0 < \frac{\delta}{A''} \leq \delta_{\max}$. We obtain the desired conclusion (11) with $C = C_w A' \cdot (A'')^m$. ■

Lemma 3 *Suppose* $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M>0}$ *is a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field. Let*

(12) $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$, $x \in E$, $M > 0, A', A'' > 0$, $P_1, \cdots P_k, Q_1, \cdots, Q_k \in \mathcal{P}$.

Assume that

(13) $P_i \in \Gamma(x, A'M)$ *for* $i = 1, \cdots, k$;

(14) $\left|\partial^\beta (P_i - P_j)(x)\right| \leq A'M\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $|\beta| \leq m-1$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, k$;

(15) $\left|\partial^\beta Q_i(x)\right| \leq A''\delta^{-|\beta|}$ *for* $|\beta| \leq m-1$ *and* $i = 1, \cdots, k$;

(16) $\sum_{i=1}^{k} Q_i \odot_x Q_i = 1$.

Then

(17) $\sum_{i=1}^{k} Q_i \odot_x Q_i \odot_x P_i \in \Gamma(x, CM)$, *with* C *determined by* A', A'', C_w, m, n, k.

Proof. We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by A', A'', C_w, m, n, k. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences. We first check (17) in the (trivial) case $k = 1$. From (16) we have $Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 = 1$, hence $\sum_{i=1}^{k} Q_i \odot_x Q_i \odot_x P_i = P_1$, and (17) follows from (13). To prove (17) for $k \geq 2$, we proceed by induction on k. In the base case $k = 2$, (17) follows at once from (12)$\cdots$(16) and Lemma 2. For the induction step, we fix $k \geq 3$ and assume the inductive hypothesis

(18) Lemma 3 holds with $(k-1)$ in place of k.

Under the assumption (18), we prove that (12)$\cdots$(16) imply (17). This will complete the proof of Lemma 3.

Suppose (12)$\cdots$(16) hold. Thanks to (16), we have $(Q_i(x))^2 \geq \frac{1}{k}$ for some $i \in \{1, \cdots, k\}$. We assume without loss of generality that

(19) $(Q_k(x))^2 \geq \frac{1}{k}$.

We then define

(20) $Q_i^{\#} = Q_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, k-2$;

(21) $Q_{k-1}^{\#} = J_x\left(\left[(Q_{k-1})^2 + (Q_k)^2\right]^{1/2}\right)$;

(22) $P_i^{\#} = P_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, k-2$;

(23) $P_{k-1}^{\#} = J_x\left(\frac{(Q_{k-1})^2 P_{k-1} + (Q_k)^2 P_k}{(Q_{k-1})^2 + (Q_k)^2}\right)$;

(24) $\tilde{Q}_1 = J_x\left(\frac{Q_{k-1}}{\left[(Q_{k-1})^2 + (Q_k)^2\right]^{1/2}}\right)$;

(25) $\tilde{Q}_2 = J_x\left(\frac{Q_k}{\left[(Q_{k-1})^2 + (Q_k)^2\right]^{1/2}}\right)$.

The above definitions make sense thanks to (19). We have the identities:

(26) $\tilde{Q}_1 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_1 + \tilde{Q}_2 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_2 = 1$,

(27) $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} Q_i^{\#} \odot Q_i^{\#} = 1$,

(28) $P_{k-1}^{\#} = \tilde{Q}_1 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_1 \odot_x P_{k-1} + \tilde{Q}_2 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_2 \odot_x P_k$, and

(29) $\sum_{i=1}^{k} Q_i \odot_x Q_i \odot_x P_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} Q_i^{\#} \odot_x Q_i^{\#} \odot_x P_i^{\#}$.

From (20), (21), (24), (25), and (15), (19), we have the estimates

(30) $\left|\partial^\beta \tilde{Q}_1(x)\right|, \left|\partial^\beta \tilde{Q}_2(x)\right| \leq C\delta^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$

and

(31) $\left|\partial^\beta Q_i^{\#}(x)\right| \leq C\delta^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$, $i = 1, \cdots, k-1$.

Note also that

(32) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P_i^{\#} - P_j^{\#}\right)(x)\right| \leq CM\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, k-1$.

Indeed (32) is immediate from (14), (22) unless i or $j = k-1$.

If (say) $i = k-1$ and $j < k-1$, then we write

$$P_{k-1}^{\#} - P_j^{\#} = \tilde{Q}_1 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_1 \odot_x (P_{k-1} - P_j) + \tilde{Q}_2 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_2 \odot_x (P_k - P_j)$$

and apply our estimates (30) and (14) to complete the proof of (32).

Thus, (32) holds in all cases.

Recall that $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{max}$. Thanks to (13), (14), (30), and (26), we may apply Lemma 2 to conclude that

$$\tilde{Q}_1 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_1 \odot_x P_{k-1} + \tilde{Q}_2 \odot_x \tilde{Q}_2 \odot_x P_k \in \Gamma(x, CM).$$

Thus,

$$P_{k-1}^{\#} \in \Gamma(x, CM) \text{ (see (28))}.$$

In view of (13) and (22), we have

(33) $P_i^{\#} \in \Gamma(x, CM)$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, k-1$.

Now, applying (27), (31), (32), (33) and our induction hypothesis (18), we conclude that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k-1} Q_i^{\#} \odot_x Q_i^{\#} \odot_x P_i^{\#} \in \Gamma(x, CM).$$

By (29), we have therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} Q_i \odot_x Q_i \odot_x P_i \in \Gamma(x, CM),$$

which is our desired conclusion (17).

This completes our induction on k, proving Lemma 3. ■

Next, we define the <u>first refinement</u> of a shape field $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ to be $\vec{\Gamma}^{\#} = \left(\Gamma^{\#}(x, M)\right)_{x \in E, M > 0}$, where $\Gamma^{\#}(x, M)$ consists of those $P^{\#} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that for all $y \in E$ there exists $P \in \Gamma(y, M)$ for which

(34) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{\#} - P\right)(x)\right| \leq M|x-y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$.

Note that each $\Gamma^{\#}(x, M)$ is a (possibly empty) convex subset of $\mathcal{P}$, and that $M' \leq M$ implies $\Gamma^{\#}(x, M') \subseteq \Gamma^{\#}(x, M)$. Thus, $\vec{\Gamma}^{\#}$ is again a shape field. Taking $y = x$ in (34), we see that $\Gamma^{\#}(x, M) \subset \Gamma(x, M)$.

Lemma 4 *Let $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ be a $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convex shape field, and $\vec{\Gamma}^{\#} = \left(\Gamma^{\#}(x, M)\right)_{x \in E, M > 0}$ be the first refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}^{\#}$. Then $\vec{\Gamma}^{\#}$ is $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex, where C is determined by C_w, m, n.*

Proof. We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by C_w, m, n. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences. Let $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$, $M > 0$, $x \in E$, $P_1^{\#}, P_2^{\#}, Q_1^{\#}, Q_2^{\#} \in \mathcal{P}$, and assume that

(35) $P_i^{\#} \in \Gamma^{\#}(x, M)$ for $i = 1, 2$;

(36) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P_1^{\#} - P_2^{\#}\right)(x)\right| \leq M\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$;

(37) $\left|\partial^{\beta} Q_i^{\#}(x)\right| \leq \delta^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$, $i = 1, 2$; and

(38) $Q_1^{\#} \odot_x Q_1^{\#} + Q_2^{\#} \odot_x Q_2^{\#} = 1.$

Under the above assumptions, we must show that

$$Q_1^{\#} \odot_x Q_1^{\#} \odot_x P_1^{\#} + Q_2^{\#} \odot_x Q_2^{\#} \odot_x P_2^{\#} \in \Gamma^{\#}(x, CM).$$

By definition of $\Gamma^{\#}(\cdot,\cdot)$, this means that given any $y \in E$ there exists

(39) $P \in \Gamma(y, CM)$ such that

(40) $|\partial^{\beta}(P^{\#} - P)(x)| \leq CM|x-y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$, where

(41) $P^{\#} = Q_1^{\#} \odot_x Q_1^{\#} \odot_x P_1^{\#} + Q_2^{\#} \odot_x Q_2^{\#} \odot_x P_2^{\#}.$

Thus, to prove Lemma 4, we must prove that there exists P satisfying (39), (40), under the assumptions (35)$\cdots$(38). We begin the proof of (39), (40) (for some P) by defining the functions

(42) $\theta_i = \frac{Q_i^{\#}}{\left[(Q_1^{\#})^2 + (Q_2^{\#})^2\right]^{1/2}}$ on $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

We pick $c_0 < 1$ small enough so that (37), (38) guarantee that θ_i is well-defined on $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ and satisfies

(43) $|\partial^{\beta}\theta_i| \leq C\delta^{-|\beta|}$ on $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ for $|\beta| \leq m$, $i = 1, 2$,

and

(44) $\theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 = 1$ on $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$.

Also

(45) $J_x(\theta_i) = Q_i^{\#}$ for $i = 1, 2$,

thanks to (38).

We now divide the proof of (39), (40) (for some P) into two cases.

CASE 1: Suppose $y \in B_n(x, c_0\delta)$.

By (35) and the definition of $\Gamma^{\#}(\cdot,\cdot)$, there exist

(46) $P_i \in \Gamma(y, M)$ $(i = 1, 2)$

satisfying

(47) $|\partial^\beta(P_i^\# - P_i)(x)| \le M|x-y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m-1$, $i = 1, 2$.

Since we are in CASE 1, estimates (36) and (47) together imply that

(48) $|\partial^\beta(P_1 - P_2)(x)| \le CM\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m-1$.

Consequently,

(49) $|\partial^\beta(P_1 - P_2)| \le CM\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ on $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ for $|\beta| \le m$.

(Recall that P_1, P_2 are polynomials of degree at most $m-1$.) In particular,

(50) $|\partial^\beta(P_1 - P_2)(y)| \le CM\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m-1$.

Thanks to (46), (50), and (43), (44), and the $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convexity of $\vec{\Gamma}$, we may apply Lemma 2 to the polynomials P_1, P_2, Q_1, Q_2, where $Q_i = J_y(\theta_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. This tells us that

(51) $P := J_y\left(\theta_1^2 P_1 + \theta_2^2 P_2\right) \in \Gamma(y, CM)$.

That is, the P in (51) satisfies (39). We will show that it also satisfies (40).

Thanks to (41), (45), we have

(52) $P^\# = J_x(\theta_1^2 P_1^\# + \theta_2^2 P_2^\#)$.

In view of (51), (52), our desired estimate (40) is equivalent to the following:

(53) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\theta_1^2 P_1^\# + \theta_2^2 P_2^\# - J_y\left(\theta_1^2 P_1 + \theta_2^2 P_2\right)\right)(x)\right| \le CM\,|x-y|^{m-|\beta|}$

for $|\beta| \le m-1$.

Thus, we have proven the existence of P satisfying (39), (40) in CASE 1, provided we can prove (53).

Since $\theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 = 1$ (see (44)) and $J_y P_1 = P_1$, the following holds on $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\theta_1^2 P_1^{\#} + \theta_2^2 P_2^{\#} - J_y\left(\theta_1^2 P_1 + \theta_2^2 P_2\right)\right) \\
= \;& \theta_1^2\left(P_1^{\#} - P_1\right) + \theta_2^2\left(P_2^{\#} - P_2\right) \\
&+ \left[\theta_1^2 P_1 + \theta_2^2 P_2 - J_y\left(\theta_1^2 P_1 + \theta_2^2 P_2\right)\right] \\
= \;& \theta_1^2\left(P_1^{\#} - P_1\right) + \theta_2^2\left(P_2^{\#} - P_2\right) \\
&+ \left[P_1 + \theta_2^2\left(P_2 - P_1\right) - J_y\left(P_1 + \theta_2^2\left(P_2 - P_1\right)\right)\right] \\
= \;& \theta_1^2\left(P_1^{\#} - P_1\right) + \theta_2^2\left(P_2^{\#} - P_2\right) \\
&+ \left[\theta_2^2\left(P_2 - P_1\right) - J_y\left(\theta_2^2\left(P_2 - P_1\right)\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the desired estimate (53) will follow if we can show that

$$(54)\quad \left|\partial^\beta\left[\theta_i\left(P_i^{\#} - P_i\right)(x)\right]\right| \le CM\,|x-y|^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1,\ i = 1,2,$$

and

$$(55)\quad \left|\partial^\beta\left[\theta_2^2\left(P_1 - P_2\right) - J_y\left(\theta_2^2\left(P_1 - P_2\right)\right)\right](x)\right| \le CM\,|x-y|^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1.$$

Moreover, (54) follows at once from (47) and (43), since $\delta^{-|\beta|} \le C\,|x-y|^{-|\beta|}$ in CASE 1.

To check (55), we apply (43) and (49) to deduce that

$$\left|\partial^\beta\left[\theta_2^2\left(P_1 - P_2\right)\right](y)\right| \le CM\delta^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for all } y \in B_n\left(x, c_0\delta\right) \text{ for } |\beta| \le m.$$

In particular, $\left|\partial^\beta\left[\theta_2^2\left(P_1 - P_2\right)\right]\right| \le CM$ on $B\left(x, c_0\delta\right)$ for $|\beta| = m$.

Therefore, (55) follows from Taylor's theorem.

This proves the existence of a P satisfying (39), (40) in CASE 1.

CASE 2: Suppose that $y \notin B_n(x, c_0\delta)$.

Since $P_1^{\#} \in \Gamma\left(x, M\right)$ (see (35)), there exists

$$(56)\quad P_1 \in \Gamma\left(y, M\right)$$

such that

$$(57)\quad \left|\partial^\beta\left(P_1^\# - P_1\right)(x)\right| \le M\,|x-y|^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1.$$

Thanks to (38), we may rewrite (41) in the form

$$P^\# = P_1^\# + Q_2^\# \odot_x Q_2^\# \odot_x \left(P_2^\# - P_1^\#\right).$$

Our assumptions (36), (37) therefore yield the estimates

$$\left|\partial^\beta\left(P^\# - P_1^\#\right)(x)\right| \le CM\delta^{m-|\beta|}$$

for $|\beta| \le m-1$.

Since we are in CASE 2, it follows that

$$(58)\quad \left|\partial^\beta\left(P^\# - P_1^\#\right)(x)\right| \le CM\,|x-y|^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1.$$

From (57) and (58), we learn that

$$(59)\quad \left|\partial^\beta\left(P^\# - P_1\right)(x)\right| \le CM\,|x-y|^{m-\beta} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1.$$

We now know from (56) and (59) that $P := P_1$ satisfies (39) and (40). Thus, in CASE 2 we again have a polynomial P satisfying (39) and (40). We have seen in all cases that there exists $P \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying (39), (40).

The proof of Lemma 4 is complete. ■

Next we define the higher refinements of a given shape field $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x,M))_{x\in E, M>0}$. By induction on $l \ge 0$, we define $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x,M))_{x\in E,M>0}$; to do so, we start with our given $\vec{\Gamma}_0$, and define $\vec{\Gamma}_{l+1}$ to be the first refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}_l$, for each $l \ge 0$. Thus, each $\vec{\Gamma}_l$ is a shape field.

Lemma 5 *(A) Let $x, y \in E$, $l \ge 1$, $M > 0$, and $P \in \Gamma_l(x,M)$. Then there exists $P' \in \Gamma_{l-1}(y,M)$ such that*

$$\left|\partial^\beta\left(P - P'\right)(x)\right| \le M\,|x-y|^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1.$$

(B) If $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ is $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convex, then for each $l \ge 0$, $\vec{\Gamma}_l$ is $(C_l, \delta_{\max})$-convex, where C_l is determined by C_w, l, m, n.

Proof. (A) is immediate from the definition of the first refinement, since $\vec{\Gamma}_l$ is the first refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}_{l-1}$.

(B) follows trivially from Lemma 4 and induction on l. ■

We call $\vec{\Gamma}_l$ the l-th refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}_0$. (This is consistent with our previous definition of the first refinement.)

I.3 Polynomial Bases

Let $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ be a shape field. Let $x_0 \in E$, $M_0 > 0$, $P^0 \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, $P_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $C_B > 0$, $\delta > 0$ be given. Then we say that $(P_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ forms an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0) if the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) $P^0 \in \Gamma(x_0, C_B M_0)$.

(2) $P^0 + \frac{M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}}{C_B}P_\alpha$, $P^0 - \frac{M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}}{C_B}P_\alpha \in \Gamma(x_0, C_B M_0)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

(3) $\partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0) = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ (Kronecker delta) for $\beta, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

(4) $\left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0)\right| \le C_B\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

We say that $(P_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ forms a weak $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0) if conditions (1), (2), (3) hold as stated, and condition (4) holds for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}, \beta \ge \alpha$.

We make a few obvious remarks.

(5) Any $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0) is also an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C'_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0), whenever $C'_B \ge C_B$.

(6) Any $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0) is also an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta', C_B\cdot[\max\{\frac{\delta'}{\delta}, \frac{\delta}{\delta'}\}]^m)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0), for any $\delta' > 0$.

(7) Any weak $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0) is also a weak $(\mathcal{A}, \delta', C'_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0), whenever $0 < \delta' \le \delta$ and $C'_B \ge C_B$.

Note that (1) need not follow from (2), since $\mathcal{A}$ may be empty.

(8) If $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$, then the existence of an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0) is equivalent to the assertion that $P^0 \in \Gamma(x_0, C_B M_0)$.

The main result of this section is Lemma 8 below. To prove it, we first establish the following result.

Lemma 6 *Let $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ be a $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convex shape field. Fix $x_0 \in E$, $M_0 > 0$, $0 < \delta \le \delta_{\max}$, $C_1 > 0$, and let P^0, $\hat{P}$, $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Assume that

(9) $P^0 + \frac{1}{C_1}\hat{P},\ P^0 - \frac{1}{C_1}\hat{P} \in \Gamma(x_0, C_1 M)$*;*

(10) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{P}(x_0)\right| \leq C_1 M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $|\beta| \leq m-1$*; and*

(11) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{S}(x_0)\right| \leq C_1 \delta^{-|\beta|}$ *for* $|\beta| \leq m-1$.

Then

(12) $P^0 + \frac{1}{C_2}\hat{S} \odot_{x_0} \hat{P},\ P^0 - \frac{1}{C_2}\hat{S} \odot_{x_0} \hat{P} \in \Gamma(x_0, C_2 M)$*, with* C_2 *determined by* C_1*,* C_w*,* m*,* n.

Proof. We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by C_1, C_w, m, n. These symbols may denote distinct constants in different occurrences. For a small enough c_0, (11) guarantees that the polynomials $Q_1 := J_{x_0}([\frac{1}{2}+c_0\hat{S}]^{1/2})$ and $Q_2 := J_{x_0}([\frac{1}{2}-c_0\hat{S}]^{1/2})$ are well-defined and satisfy

(13) $|\partial^\beta Q_i(x_0)| \leq C\delta^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$, $i = 1, 2$;

(14) $Q_1 \odot_{x_0} Q_1 = \frac{1}{2} + c_0\hat{S}$, $Q_2 \odot_{x_0} Q_2 = \frac{1}{2} - c_0\hat{S}$, $Q_1 \odot_{x_0} Q_1 + Q_2 \odot_{x_0} Q_2 = 1$.

Define $P^1 = P^0 + \frac{1}{C_1}\hat{P}$, $P^2 = P^0 - \frac{1}{C_1}\hat{P}$. Then

(15) $P^1, P^2 \in \Gamma(x_0, C_1 M_0)$ and

(16) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^1 - P^2\right)(x_0)\right| \leq C M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$.

Recall that $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$. Hence, (13)$\cdots$(16) and Lemma 2 together imply that

$$P := Q_1 \odot_{x_0} Q_1 \odot_{x_0} P^1 + Q_2 \odot_{x_0} Q_2 \odot_{x_0} P^2 \in \Gamma(x_0, CM_0).$$

However, (14) and the definitions of P^1, P^2, P yield

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \left[\frac{1}{2} + c_0\hat{S}\right] \odot_{x_0} \left[P^0 + \frac{\hat{P}}{C_1}\right] + \left[\frac{1}{2} - c_0\hat{S}\right] \odot_{x_0} \left[P^0 - \frac{\hat{P}}{C_1}\right] \\ &= P^0 + \frac{2c_0}{C_1}\hat{S} \odot_{x_0} \hat{P}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$P^0 + \frac{2c_0}{C_1}\hat{S} \odot_{x_0} \hat{P} \in \Gamma(x_0, CM_0). \tag{17}$$

Replacing $\hat{S}$ by $-\hat{S}$ in the proof of (17), we learn that also

$$P^0 - \frac{2c_0}{C_1}\hat{S} \odot_{x_0} \hat{P} \in \Gamma(x_0, CM_0). \tag{18}$$

Taking $C_2 > \max\left\{C, \frac{C_1}{2c_0}\right\}$ with C as in (17) and (18), we obtain from (17), (18) and convexity of $\Gamma(x_0, CM_0)$ that $P^0 \pm \frac{\hat{S}\odot_{x_0}\hat{P}}{C_2} \in \Gamma(x_0, CM) \subseteq \Gamma(x_0, C_2M)$, where the last inclusion holds because $\vec{\Gamma}$ is a shape field.

The proof of Lemma 6 is complete. ■

We also need the following result, which is immediate[2] from Lemma 16.1 in [10].

Lemma 7 (Rescaling Lemma) *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, and let C, a be positive real numbers. Suppose we are given real numbers $F_{\alpha,\beta}$, indexed by $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied.*

(19) $F_{\alpha,\alpha} \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

(20) $|F_{\alpha,\beta}| \leq C \cdot |F_{\alpha,\alpha}|$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\beta \geq \alpha$.

(21) $F_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$.

Then there exist positive numbers $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$ and a map $\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{M}$, with the following properties:

(22) $c(a) \leq \lambda_i \leq 1$ for each i, where $c(a)$ is determined by C, a, m, n;

(23) $\phi(\alpha) \leq \alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$;

(24) For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, either $\phi(\alpha) = \alpha$ or $\phi(\alpha) \notin \mathcal{A}$.

Suppose we define $\hat{F}_{\alpha,\beta} = \lambda^\beta F_{\alpha,\beta}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, where we recall that λ^β denotes $\lambda_1^{\beta_1} \cdots \lambda_n^{\beta_n}$ for $\beta = (\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n)$. Then

[2]Lemma 16.1 in [10] involves also real numbers $F_{\alpha,\beta}$ with $|\beta| = m$. Setting those $F_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$, we recover the Rescaling Lemma stated here.

(25) $|\hat{F}_{\alpha,\beta}| \le a \cdot |\hat{F}_{\alpha,\phi(\alpha)}|$ *for* $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{\phi(\alpha)\}$.

Lemma 3.3 in [10] tells us that any map $\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{M}$ satisfying (23), (24) satisfies also

(26) $\phi(\mathcal{A}) \le \mathcal{A}$, with equality only if ϕ is the identity map.

We are ready to state the main result of this section.

Lemma 8 (Relabeling Lemma) *Let* $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field. Let* $x_0 \in E$, $M_0 > 0$, $0 < \delta \le \delta_{\max}$, $C_B > 0$, $P^0 \in \Gamma(x_0, M_0)$, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. *Suppose* $\left(P_\alpha^{00}\right)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ *is a weak* $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$*-basis for* $\vec{\Gamma}$ *at* (x_0, M_0, P^o). *Then, for some monotonic* $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \le \mathcal{A}$, $\vec{\Gamma}$ *has an* $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C'_B)$*-basis at* (x_0, M_0, P^0), *with* C'_B *determined by* C_B, C_w, m, n. *Moreover, if* $\max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}} \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} |\partial^\beta P_\alpha^{00}(x_0)|$ *exceeds a large enough constant determined by* C_B, C_w, m, n, *then we can take* $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ *(strict inequality).*

Proof. If $\mathcal{A}$ is empty, then we can take $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ empty; note that

$$\max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}} \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} |\partial^\beta P_\alpha^{00}(x_0)|$$

is defined to be zero for $\mathcal{A}$ empty. Thus, Lemma 8 holds trivially for $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$. We suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$.

Without loss of generality, we may take $x_0 = 0$. We introduce a constant $a > 0$ to be picked later, satisfying the

Small a *condition:* a *is less than a small enough constant determined by* C_B, C_w, m, n.

We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by C_B, C_w, m, n; and we write $c(a)$, $C(a)$, $C'(a)$, etc., to denote constants determined by a, C_B, C_w, m, n. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences.

Since $(P_\alpha^{00})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is a weak $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at $(0, M_0, P^0)$, we have the following.

(27) $P^0, P^0 \pm cM_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|} P_\alpha^{00} \in \Gamma(0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

(28) $\partial^\beta P_\alpha^{00}(0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for $\beta, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

(29) $\left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha^{00}(0)\right| \le C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\beta \ge \alpha$.

Thanks to (28), (29), the numbers $F_{\alpha,\beta} = \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\partial^\beta P_\alpha^{00}(0)$ satisfy (19), (20), (21). Applying Lemma 7, we obtain real numbers $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$ and a map $\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{M}$ satisfying (22), $\cdots$, (25). We define a linear map $T : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by setting

(30) $T(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = (\lambda_1 x_1, \cdots, \lambda_n x_n)$ for $(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

From (22) $\cdots$ (25) for our $F_{\alpha,\beta}$, we obtain the following.

(31) $c(a) \le \lambda_i \le 1$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(32) $\phi(\alpha) \le \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

(33) For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, either $\phi(\alpha) = \alpha$ or $\phi(\alpha) \notin \mathcal{A}$.

(34) $\delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^\beta\left(P_\alpha^{00} \circ T\right)(0)\right| \le a \cdot \delta^{|\phi(\alpha)|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^{\phi(\alpha)}\left(P_\alpha^{00} \circ T\right)(0)\right|$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}\backslash\phi(\alpha)$.

Since the left-hand side of (34) is equal to $\lambda^\beta \ge c(a)$ for $\beta = \alpha$ (by (28) and (31)), it follows from (34) that

(35) $\delta^{|\phi(\alpha)|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^{\phi(\alpha)}\left(P_\alpha^{00} \circ T\right)(0)\right| \ge c(a)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

We define

(36) $\bar{\mathcal{A}} = \phi(\mathcal{A})$

and introduce a map

(37) $\psi : \bar{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathcal{A}$

such that

(38) $\phi(\psi(\bar{\alpha})) = \bar{\alpha}$ for all $\bar{\alpha} \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}$.

Thanks to (32), (33), and Lemma 3.3 in [10] (mentioned above), we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}} \le \mathcal{A},$$

with equality only when ϕ =identity. Moreover, suppose ϕ = identity. Then (28) and (34) show that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\lambda^\beta \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\partial^\beta P_\alpha^{00}(0)\right| &= \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^\beta\left(P_\alpha^{00} \circ T\right)(0)\right| \\ &\le \left|\partial^\alpha\left(P_\alpha^{00} \circ T\right)(0)\right| \\ &= \lambda^\alpha\end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$. Hence, (31) yields

(39) $\delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^{\beta}P_{\alpha}^{00}(0)\right| \le C(a)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$;

this holds provided ϕ =identity.

If $\max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\beta\in\mathcal{M}} \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^{\beta}P_{\alpha}^{00}(0)\right| > C(a)$ with $C(a)$ as in (39), then ϕ cannot be the identity map, and therefore $\bar{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality).

Thus,

(40) $\bar{\mathcal{A}} \le \mathcal{A}$, with strict inequality if $\max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\beta\in\mathcal{M}} \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^{\beta}P_{\alpha}^{00}(0)\right|$ exceeds a large enough constant determined by a, C_w, C_B, m, n.

For $\bar{\alpha} \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}$, we define

(41) $b_{\bar{\alpha}} = \left[\delta^{|\bar{\alpha}|-|\psi(\bar{\alpha})|}\partial^{\bar{\alpha}}\left(P_{\psi(\bar{\alpha})}^{00} \circ T\right)(0)\right]^{-1}$;

estimate (35) with $\alpha = \psi(\bar{\alpha})$ gives

(42) $|b_{\bar{\alpha}}| \le C(a)$ for all $\bar{\alpha} \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}$.

For $\bar{\alpha} \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}$, we also define

(43) $\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}} = b_{\bar{\alpha}}\delta^{|\bar{\alpha}|-|\psi(\bar{\alpha})|} \cdot P_{\psi(\bar{\alpha})}^{00}$.

From (34), (41), (43), we find that

(44) $\left|\delta^{|\beta|-|\bar{\alpha}|}\partial^{\beta}\left(\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}} \circ T\right)(0) - \delta_{\beta\bar{\alpha}}\right| \le a$ for $\bar{\alpha} \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Note that $\delta^{m-|\bar{\alpha}|}\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}} = b_{\bar{\alpha}}\delta^{m-|\psi(\bar{\alpha})|}P_{\psi(\bar{\alpha})}^{00}$. Hence, (42) and (27) (with $\alpha = \psi(\bar{\alpha})$) tell us that

(45) $P^0 \pm c(a)M_0\delta^{m-|\bar{\alpha}|}\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}} \in \Gamma(0, CM_0)$,

since $\Gamma(0, CM_0)$ is convex.

Next, define

(46) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \left\{\gamma \in \mathcal{M} : \gamma = \bar{\alpha} + \bar{\gamma} \text{ for some } \bar{\alpha} \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{\gamma} \in \mathcal{M}\right\}$,

and introduce maps $\chi : \hat{\mathcal{A}} \to \bar{\mathcal{A}}$, $\omega : \hat{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathcal{M}$, such that

(47) $\hat{\alpha} = \chi(\hat{\alpha}) + \omega(\hat{\alpha})$ for all $\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

By definition (46),

(48) $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is monotonic,

and $\bar{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, hence

(49) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bar{\mathcal{A}}$.

From (40) and (49), we have

(50) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \leq \mathcal{A}$, with strict inequality if $\max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}} \delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} \left|\partial^{\beta} P_{\alpha}^{00}(0)\right|$ exceeds a large enough constant determined by a, C_w, C_B, m, n.

For $\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, we introduce the monomial

(51) $S_{\hat{\alpha}}(x) = \frac{\chi(\hat{\alpha})!}{\hat{\alpha}!} \lambda^{-\omega(\hat{\alpha})} x^{\omega(\hat{\alpha})}$ $(x \in \mathbb{R}^n)$.

We have

(52) $S_{\hat{\alpha}} \circ T(x) = \frac{\chi(\hat{\alpha})!}{\hat{\alpha}!} x^{\omega(\hat{\alpha})}$,

hence

(53) $\partial^{\beta}\left(S_{\hat{\alpha}} \circ T\right)(0) = \frac{\chi(\hat{\alpha})!\omega(\hat{\alpha})!}{\hat{\alpha}!} \delta_{\beta\omega(\hat{\alpha})}$ for $\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

We study the derivatives $\partial^{\beta}\left(\left[\left(S_{\hat{\alpha}} \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right) \circ T\right](0)\right)$ for $\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Case 1: If β is not of the form $\beta = \omega(\hat{\alpha}) + \tilde{\beta}$ for some $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathcal{M}$, then (53) gives

(54) $\partial^{\beta}\left[\left(S_{\hat{\alpha}} \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right) \circ T\right](0) = 0$.

Case 2: Suppose $\beta = \omega(\hat{\alpha}) + \tilde{\beta}$ for some $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then (53) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial^{\beta}\left[\left(S_{\hat{\alpha}} \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right) \circ T\right](0) \\
= & \frac{\beta!}{\omega(\hat{\alpha})!\tilde{\beta}!}\left[\partial^{\omega(\hat{\alpha})}\left(S_{\hat{\alpha}} \circ T\right)(0)\right] \cdot \left[\partial^{\bar{\beta}}\left(\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \circ T\right)(0)\right] \\
= & \frac{\beta!}{\omega(\hat{\alpha})!\tilde{\beta}!} \frac{\chi(\hat{\alpha})!\omega(\hat{\alpha})!}{\hat{\alpha}!} \cdot \left[\partial^{\bar{\beta}}\left(\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \circ T\right)(0)\right] \\
= & \frac{\beta!\chi(\hat{\alpha})!}{\hat{\alpha}!\tilde{\beta}!}\left[\partial^{\bar{\beta}}\left(\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \circ T\right)(0)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (44), we have

$$\left|\frac{\hat{\alpha}!\tilde{\beta}!}{\beta!\chi(\hat{\alpha})!}\delta^{|\tilde{\beta}|-|\chi(\hat{\alpha})|}\partial^{\beta}\left[\left(S_{\hat{\alpha}}\cdot\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right)\circ T\right](0)-\delta_{\tilde{\beta}\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right|\leq a. \tag{55}$$

Since in this case $\beta=\omega(\hat{\alpha})+\tilde{\beta}$ and $\hat{\alpha}=\omega(\hat{\alpha})+\chi(\hat{\alpha})$ (see (47)), we have $\delta_{\tilde{\beta}\chi(\hat{\alpha})}=\delta_{\beta\hat{\alpha}}$, $|\tilde{\beta}|-|\chi(\hat{\alpha})|=|\beta|-|\hat{\alpha}|$, and $\frac{\hat{\alpha}!\tilde{\beta}!}{\beta!\chi(\hat{\alpha})!}=1$ if $\beta=\hat{\alpha}$.

Hence, (55) implies that

$$\left|\delta^{|\beta|-|\hat{\alpha}|}\partial^{\beta}\left[\left(S_{\hat{\alpha}}\cdot\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right)\circ T\right](0)-\delta_{\beta\hat{\alpha}}\right|\leq Ca \tag{56}$$

in Case 2.

Thanks to (47) and (54), estimate (56) holds also in Case 1.

Thus, (56) holds for all $\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$. Consequently,

$$\left|\delta^{|\beta|-|\hat{\alpha}|}\partial^{\beta}\left(\left[S_{\hat{\alpha}}\odot_0\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right]\circ T(0)\right)-\delta_{\beta\hat{\alpha}}\right|\leq Ca \tag{57}$$

for all $\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$.

We prepare to apply Lemma 6, with $\hat{S}=\delta^{-|\omega(\hat{\alpha})|}S_{\hat{\alpha}}$ and $\hat{P}=M_0\delta^{m-|\chi(\hat{\alpha})|}\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}$. From (31) and (51), we have

$$\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(\delta^{-|\omega(\hat{\alpha})|}S_{\hat{\alpha}}\right)(0)\right|\leq C(a)\,\delta^{-|\beta|}\text{ for }\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}},\ \beta\in\mathcal{M}. \tag{58}$$

From (44) we have

$$\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\circ T\right)(0)\right|\leq C\delta^{|\chi(\hat{\alpha})|-|\beta|}\text{ for }\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}},\ \beta\in\mathcal{M};$$

hence, by (31),

$$\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(M_0\delta^{m-|\chi(\hat{\alpha})|}\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right)(0)\right|\leq C(a)\,M_0\delta^{m-|\beta|}\text{ for }\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}},\ \beta\in\mathcal{M}. \tag{59}$$

Also, (45) gives

$$P^0\pm c(a)\,M_0\delta^{m-|\chi(\hat{\alpha})|}\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\in\Gamma(0,CM_0)\text{ for }\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{60}$$

Our results (58), (59), (60) are the hypotheses of Lemma 6 for $\hat{S}$, $\hat{P}$ as given above. Applying that lemma, we learn that

$$P^0\pm c(a)\left(\delta^{-|\omega(\hat{\alpha})|}S_{\hat{\alpha}}\right)\odot_0\left(M_0\delta^{m-|\chi(\hat{\alpha})|}\bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})}\right)\in\Gamma(0,C(a)\,M_0)\text{ for }\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Recalling (47), we conclude that

$$P^0 \pm c(a) M_0 \delta^{m-|\hat{\alpha}|} S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \in \Gamma(0, C(a) M_0) \text{ for } \hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{61}$$

Next, (57) and the *small* a *condition* tell us that there exists a matrix of real numbers $(b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}})_{\gamma,\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}} \partial^\beta \left(\left[S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \right] \circ T \right)(0) \cdot \delta^{|\beta|-|\hat{\alpha}|} = \delta_{\gamma\beta} \text{ for } \gamma, \beta \in \hat{\mathcal{A}} \tag{62}$$

and

$$|b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}}| \leq 2, \text{ for all } \gamma, \hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{63}$$

From (62) we have

$$\partial^\beta \left\{ \sum_{\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\hat{\alpha}|} \left(\left[S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \right] \circ T \right) \right\}(0) = \delta_{\gamma\beta} \text{ for } \gamma, \beta \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{64}$$

Also, (57) and (63) imply that

$$\left| \partial^\beta \left\{ \sum_{\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\hat{\alpha}|} \left(\left[S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \right] \circ T \right) \right\}(0) \right| \leq C\delta^{|\gamma|-|\beta|} \text{ for } \gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{65}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} \left\{ \sum_{\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\hat{\alpha}|} \left(\left[S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \right] \right) \right\} \\ = & \sum_{\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}} \cdot \left\{ M_0 \delta^{m-|\hat{\alpha}|} \cdot \left[S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

we learn from (61), (63), and the Trivial Remark on Convex Sets in Section I.1, that

$$P^0 \pm c(a) M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} \left\{ \sum_{\hat{\alpha}\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\hat{\alpha}|} \left(\left[S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \right] \right) \right\} \in \Gamma(0, C(a) M_0) \tag{66}$$

for $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

We define

$$P_\gamma = \lambda^\gamma \sum_{\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}} b_{\gamma\hat{\alpha}} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\hat{\alpha}|} \left[S_{\hat{\alpha}} \odot_0 \bar{P}_{\chi(\hat{\alpha})} \right] \text{ for } \gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{67}$$

From (31), we have $|\lambda^\gamma| \leq C(a)$. Recall from (27) that $P^0 \in \Gamma(0, CM_0)$. Hence, we deduce from (66) (and from the convexity of $\Gamma(0, C(a) M_0)$) that

$$P^0, P^0 + c(a) M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} P_\gamma, P^0 - c(a) M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} P_\gamma \in \Gamma(0, C(a) M_0) \text{ for } \gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{68}$$

Also, (64) and (67) give

$$\partial^\beta P_\gamma(0) = \delta_{\beta\gamma} \text{ for } \beta, \gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{69}$$

From (31), (65), (67), we have

$$\left| \partial^\beta P_\gamma(0) \right| \leq C(a) \delta^{|\gamma|-|\beta|} \text{ for } \gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}},\ \beta \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{70}$$

Our results (68), (69), (70) show that

$$(P_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}} \text{ is an } \left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C(a)\right)\text{-basis for } \vec{\Gamma} \text{ at } \left(0, M_0, P^0\right). \tag{71}$$

We now pick a to to be a constant determined by C_B, C_w, m, n, small enough to satisfy our *small* a *condition*. Then (48), (50), and (71) immediately imply the conclusions of Lemma 8.

The proof of that lemma is complete. ■

The next result is a consequence of the Relabeling Lemma (Lemma 8).

Lemma 9 (Control Γ Using Basis) *Let* $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field. Let* $x_0 \in E$, $M_0 > 0$, $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$, $C_B > 0$, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, *and let* P, $P^0 \in \mathcal{P}$. *Suppose* $\vec{\Gamma}$ *has an* $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$*-basis at* $\left(x_0, M_0, P^0\right)$. *Suppose also that*

(72) $P \in \Gamma(x_0, C_B M_0)$,

(73) $\partial^\beta \left(P - P^0\right)(x_0) = 0$ *for all* $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$, *and*

(74) $\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}} \delta^{|\beta|} \left| \partial^\beta \left(P - P^0\right)(x_0) \right| \geq M_0 \delta^m$.

Then there exist $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ *and* $\hat{\mathsf{P}}^0 \in \mathcal{P}$ *with the following properties.*

(75) $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ *is monotonic.*

(76) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ *(strict inequality).*

(77) $\vec{\Gamma}$ *has an* $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, \mathsf{C}'_{\mathrm{B}})$*-basis at* $(x_0, \mathsf{M}_0, \hat{\mathsf{P}}^0)$*, with* C'_{B} *determined by* C_{B}*,* C_w*,* $\mathfrak{m}$*,* $\mathfrak{n}$*.*

(78) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{\mathsf{P}}^0 - \mathsf{P}^0\right)(x_0) = 0$ *for all* $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$*.*

(79) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{\mathsf{P}}^0 - \mathsf{P}^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq \mathsf{M}_0 \delta^{\mathfrak{m}-|\beta|}$ *for all* $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$*.*

Proof. We write $\mathfrak{c}$, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by C_{B}, C_w, $\mathfrak{m}$, $\mathfrak{n}$. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences.

Let $(\mathsf{P}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ be an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{B}})$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at $(x_0, \mathsf{M}_0, \mathsf{P}^0)$. By definition,

(80) $\mathsf{P}^0 \in \Gamma(x_0, \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{B}}\mathsf{M}_0)$,

(81) $\mathsf{P}^0 \pm \mathfrak{c}\mathsf{M}_0\delta^{\mathfrak{m}-|\alpha|}\mathsf{P}_\alpha \in \Gamma\left(x_0, \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{B}}\mathsf{M}\right)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$,

(82) $\partial^\beta \mathsf{P}_\alpha(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for $\beta, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$,

(83) $\left|\partial^\beta \mathsf{P}_\alpha(x_0)\right| \leq \mathsf{C}\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathsf{A}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Thanks to (80), we may replace P by a convex combination of P^0 and P in (72), (73), (74) to retain (72), (73) but replace (74) by the stronger assertion

(84) $\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}} \delta^{|\beta|} \left|\partial^\beta \left(\mathsf{P} - \mathsf{P}^0\right)(x_0)\right| = \mathsf{M}_0\delta^{\mathfrak{m}}$.

We pick $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ to achieve the above max. Thanks to (73), we have

(85) $\gamma \notin \mathcal{A}$,

hence

(86) $\mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\} < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality).

We set

(87) $\hat{\mathsf{P}}^0 = \frac{1}{2}(\mathsf{P}^0 + \mathsf{P})$.

From (72), (80), (81), we have

(88) $\hat{P}^0, \hat{P}^0 \pm c' M_0 \delta^{m-|\alpha|} P_\alpha \in \Gamma(x_0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

Also,

(89) $\hat{P}^0 \pm \frac{1}{2}\left(P - P^0\right) \in \Gamma(x_0, CM)$

since $\hat{P}^0 + \frac{1}{2}\left(P - P^0\right) = P$ and $\hat{P}^0 - \frac{1}{2}\left(P - P^0\right) = P^0$.
From (73) and (84), we have

(90) $\partial^\beta\left(\hat{P}^0 - P^0\right)(x_0) = 0$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$,

and

(91) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\hat{P}^0 - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

We define

(92) $P_\gamma^\# = \left[\partial^\gamma\left(P - P^0\right)(x_0)\right]^{-1} \cdot \left(P - P^0\right)$.

We are not dividing by zero here; by (84) and the definition of γ, we have

(93) $\left|\partial^\gamma\left(P - P^0\right)(x_0)\right|^{-1} = M_0^{-1}\delta^{|\gamma|-m}$.

From (73), (85), (92), we have

(94) $\partial^\beta P_\gamma^\#(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\}$.

Also, (84), (92), (93) give

(95) $\left|\partial^\beta P_\gamma^\#(x_0)\right| \leq M_0^{-1}\delta^{|\gamma|-m} \cdot M_0\delta^{m-|\beta|} = \delta^{|\gamma|-|\beta|}$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

From (92), (93), we have $P - P^0 = \sigma M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} P_\gamma^\#$ for $\sigma = 1$ or $\sigma = -1$. Therefore, (89) implies that

(96) $\hat{P}^0 \pm cM_0\delta^{m-|\gamma|}P_\gamma^\# \in \Gamma(x_0, CM_0)$.

From (88), (96) and the Trivial Remark on Convex Sets in Section I.1, we conclude that

(97) $\hat{P}^0 + sM_0\delta^{m-|\gamma|}P_\gamma^\# + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} t_\alpha \cdot M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P_\alpha \in \Gamma(x_0, CM_0)$,

whenever $|s|, |t_\alpha| \leq c$ (all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$) for a small enough c.

For $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, we define

(98) $P_\alpha^\# = P_\alpha - [\partial^\gamma P_\alpha(x_0)] \cdot P_\gamma^\#$.

Fix $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$, then (82), (85), (94) imply

$$\partial^\beta P_\alpha^\#(x_0) = \partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0) - [\partial^\gamma P_\alpha(x_0)] \cdot \partial^\beta P_\gamma^\#(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}.$$

On the other hand, (85) and (94) yield

$$\partial^\gamma P_\alpha^\#(x_0) = \partial^\gamma P_\alpha(x_0) - [\partial^\gamma P_\alpha(x_0)] \cdot \partial^\gamma P_\gamma^\#(x_0) = 0 = \delta_{\gamma\alpha}.$$

Thus,

$$\partial^\beta P_\alpha^\#(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha} \text{ for } \beta \in \mathcal{A}\cup\{\gamma\},\ \alpha \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Together with (94), this tells us that

(99) $\partial^\beta P_\alpha^\#(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for $\beta, \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\}$.

Next, we learn from (83), (95), (98) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha^\#(x_0)\right| &\leq \left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0)\right| + |\partial^\gamma P_\alpha(x_0)| \cdot \left|\partial^\beta P_\gamma^\#(x_0)\right| \\ &\leq C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|} + C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\gamma|} \cdot \delta^{|\gamma|-|\beta|} \\ &\leq C'\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|} \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (95), this tells us that

(100) $\left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha^\#(x_0)\right| \leq C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Next, note that for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P_\alpha^\# = M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P_\alpha - \left[\delta^{|\gamma|-|\alpha|}\partial^\gamma P_\alpha(x_0)\right] \cdot M_0\delta^{m-|\gamma|}P_\gamma^\#,$$

with $\left|\left[\delta^{|\gamma|-|\alpha|}\partial^\gamma P_\alpha(x_0)\right]\right| \leq C$ by (83).

Therefore, (97) shows that

$$\hat{P}^0 \pm cM_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P_\alpha^\# \in \Gamma(x_0, CM_0) \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathcal{A},$$

provided we take c small enough. Together with (96), this yields

(101) $\hat{P}^0 \pm c M_0 \delta^{m-|\alpha|} P_\alpha^\# \in \Gamma(x_0, C M_0)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\}$.

Our results (99), (100), (101) tell us that $\left(P_\alpha^\#\right)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\}}$ is an $(\mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\}, \delta, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}$ at $\left(x_0, M_0, \hat{P}^0\right)$.

Consequently, the Relabeling Lemma (Lemma 8) produces a set $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ with the following properties.

(102) $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is monotonic.

(103) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \leq \mathcal{A} \cup \{\gamma\} < \mathcal{A}$, see (86).

(104) $\vec{\Gamma}$ has an $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C')$-basis at $(x_0, M_0, \hat{P}^0)$.

Our results (102), (103), (104), (90), (91) are the conclusions (75)$\cdots$(79) of Lemma 9.

The proof of that lemma is complete. ■

I.4 The Transport Lemma

In this section, we prove the following result.

Lemma 10 (Transport Lemma) *Let $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ be a shape field. For $l \geq 1$, let $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ be the l-th refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}_0$.*

(1) Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is monotonic and $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ (not necessarily monotonic).

Let $x_0 \in E$, $M_0 > 0$, $l_0 \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$, C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, $C_{DIFF} > 0$. Let P^0, $\hat{P}^0 \in \mathcal{P}$. Assume that the following hold.

(2) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0}$ has an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis at $\left(x_0, M_0, P^0\right)$, and an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, \hat{C}_B\right)$-basis at $\left(x_0, M_0, \hat{P}^0\right)$.

(3) $\partial^\beta (P^0 - \hat{P}^0) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

(4) $|\partial^\beta (P^0 - \hat{P}^0)(x_0)| \leq C_{DIFF} M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Let $y_0 \in E$, and suppose that

(5) $|x_0 - y_0| \le \epsilon_0 \delta$,

where ϵ_0 *is a a small enough constant determined by* C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, C_{DIFF}, m, n. *Then there exists* $\hat{P}^\# \in \mathcal{P}$ *with the following properties.*

(6) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ *has both an* $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C'_B)$*-basis and an* $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C'_B)$*-basis at* $(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^\#)$, *with* C'_B *determined by* C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, C_{DIFF}, m, n.

(7) $\partial^\beta(\hat{P}^\# - P^0) \equiv 0$ *for* $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

(8) $|\partial^\beta(\hat{P}^\# - P^0)(x_0)| \le C' M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, *with* C' *determined by* C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, C_{DIFF}, m, n.

Remark *Note that* $\mathcal{A}$ *and* $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ *play different rôles here; see* (1), (3), *and* (7).

Proof of the Transport Lemma. In the trivial case $\mathcal{A} = \hat{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$, the Transport Lemma holds simply because (by definition of the l-th refinement) there exists $\hat{P}^\# \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, C_B M_0)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^\# - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| &\le C_B M_0 |x_0 - y_0|^{m-|\beta|} \\ &\le C_B M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } \beta \in \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

(Recall that $P^0 \in \Gamma_{l_0}(x_0, C_B M_0)$ since $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0}$ has an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis at $\left(x_0, M_0, P^0\right)$.)

From now on, we suppose that

$$\#(\mathcal{A}) + \#\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}\right) \neq 0. \tag{9}$$

In proving the Transport Lemma, we do not yet take ϵ_0 to be a constant determined by C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, C_{DIFF}, m, n. Rather, we make the following

(10) *Small* ϵ_0 *assumption:* ϵ_0 *is less than a small enough constant determined by* C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, C_{DIFF}, m, n.

Assuming $(1)\cdots(5)$ and (9), (10), we will prove that there exists $\hat{P}^\# \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying (6), (7), (8). Once we do so, we may then pick ϵ_0 to be a constant determined by C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, C_{DIFF}, m, n, small enough to satisfy (10). That will complete the proof of the Transport Lemma.

Thus, assume $(1)\cdots(5)$ and (9), (10).

We write c, C, C', etc. to denote "controlled constants", i.e., constants determined by C_B, $\hat{C}_B$, C_{DIFF}, m, n. These symbols may denote different controlled constants in different occurrences.

Let $(P_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ be an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0}$ at (x_0, M_0, P^0), and let $(\hat{P}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}}$ be an $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, \hat{C}_B)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0}$ at $(x_0, M_0, \hat{P}^0)$.

By definition, the following hold.

(11) $P^0 + c_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l_0}(x_0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\sigma \in \{1,-1\}$.

(12) $\hat{P}^0 + \hat{c}_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\hat{P}_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l_0}(x_0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\sigma \in \{1,-1\}$.

(13) $\partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

(14) $\partial^\beta \hat{P}_\alpha(x_0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

(15) $\left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha(x_0)\right| \le C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

(16) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{P}_\alpha(x_0)\right| \le C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

We fix controlled constants $c_0, \hat{c}_0$ as in (11), (12). Recall that $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0}$ is the first refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$. Therefore, by (10), (11), there exists $\tilde{P}_{\alpha,\sigma} \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$ $(\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \sigma \in \{1,-1\})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\partial^\beta\left(\tilde{P}_{\alpha,\sigma} - \left[P^0 + c_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P_\alpha\right]\right)(x_0)\right| \\ \le\ & CM_0|x_0 - y_0|^{m-|\beta|} \le C\epsilon_0 M_0\delta^{m-|\beta|}, \text{ for } \beta \in \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

Writing

$$E_{\alpha,\sigma} = \frac{\tilde{P}_{\alpha,\sigma} - \left[P^0 + c_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P_\alpha\right]}{c_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}},$$

we have

(17) $P^0 + c_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}(P_\alpha + E_{\alpha,\sigma}) \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \sigma \in \{1,-1\}$,

and

(18) $\left|\partial^\beta E_{\alpha,\sigma}(x_0)\right| \le C\epsilon_0\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\sigma \in \{1,-1\}$.

Similarly, we obtain $\hat{E}_{\alpha,\sigma} \in \mathcal{P}$ $\left(\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \sigma \in \{1,-1\}\right)$, satisfying

(19) $\hat{P}^0 + \hat{c}_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left(\hat{P}_\alpha + \hat{E}_{\alpha,\sigma}\right) \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\sigma \in \{1,-1\}$,

and

(20) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{E}_{\alpha,\sigma}(x_0)\right| \le C\epsilon_0\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\sigma \in \{1,-1\}$.

We introduce the following polynomials:

(21)

$$\hat{P}' = \frac{1}{2}\left[\#(\mathcal{A}) + \#\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}\right)\right]^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\sigma=\pm 1}\left\{P^0 + c_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left(P_\alpha + E_{\alpha,\sigma}\right)\right\} \\ +\sum_{\alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}},\sigma=\pm 1}\left\{\hat{P}^0 + \hat{c}_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left(\hat{P}_\alpha + \hat{E}_{\alpha,\sigma}\right)\right\} \end{pmatrix}$$

(see (9));

(22)

$$\begin{aligned} P'_\alpha &= \frac{1}{2c_0M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}} \begin{pmatrix} \left\{P^0 + c_0M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left(P_\alpha + E_{\alpha,1}\right)\right\} \\ -\left\{P^0 - c_0M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left(P_\alpha + E_{\alpha,-1}\right)\right\} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= P_\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\left(E_{\alpha,1} + E_{\alpha,-1}\right) \text{ for } \alpha\in\mathcal{A}; \end{aligned}$$

(23)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}'_\alpha &= \frac{1}{2\hat{c}_0M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}} \begin{pmatrix} \left\{\hat{P}^0 + \hat{c}_0M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left(\hat{P}_\alpha + \hat{E}_{\alpha,1}\right)\right\} \\ -\left\{\hat{P}^0 - \hat{c}_0M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left(\hat{P}_\alpha + \hat{E}_{\alpha,-1}\right)\right\} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \hat{P}_\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\left(\hat{E}_{\alpha,1} + \hat{E}_{\alpha,-1}\right) \text{ for } \alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}. \end{aligned}$$

For a small enough controlled constant c_1, we have

(24) $\hat{P}' + c_1M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P'_\alpha, \hat{P}' - c_1M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P'_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$,

and

(25) $\hat{P}' + c_1M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\hat{P}'_\alpha, \hat{P}' - c_1M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\hat{P}'_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$ for $\alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}$,

because each of the polynomials in (24), (25) is a convex combination of the polynomials in (17), (19).

From (24), (25) and the Trivial Remark on Convex Sets in Section I.1, we obtain the following, for a small enough controlled constant c_2.

(26) $\hat{P}' + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} s_\alpha M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P'_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} t_\alpha M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\hat{P}'_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$, whenever $|s_\alpha| \le c_2$ for all $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$ and $|t_\alpha| \le c_2$ for all $\alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

Note also that (21) may be written in the equivalent form

(27)

$$\hat{P}' = P^0 + \left[\frac{\#\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}\right)}{\#\left(\mathcal{A}\right) + \#\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}\right)}\right]\left(\hat{P}^0 - P^0\right)$$
$$+\frac{1}{2\left[\#\left(\mathcal{A}\right) + \#\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}\right)\right]}\left\{\begin{array}{c}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\sigma=\pm1} c_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}E_{\alpha,\sigma} \\ +\sum_{\alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}},\sigma=\pm1}\hat{c}_0\sigma M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\hat{E}_{\alpha,\sigma}\end{array}\right\}.$$

Consequently, (3), (4), (18), (20) tell us that

(28) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\hat{P}' - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \le C\epsilon_0 M_0\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$;

(29) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\hat{P}' - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \le CM_0\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Similarly, (13)$\cdots$(16), (18), (20), and (22), (23) together imply the estimates

(30) $\left|\partial^\beta P'_\alpha(x_0) - \delta_{\beta\alpha}\right| \le C\epsilon_0\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$;

(31) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{P}'_\alpha(x_0) - \delta_{\beta\alpha}\right| \le C\epsilon_0\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$;

(32) $\left|\partial^\beta P'_\alpha(x_0)\right| \le C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$; and

(33) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{P}'_\alpha(x_0)\right| \le C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

From (30)$\cdots$(33) and (5), we have also

(34) $\left|\partial^\beta P'_\alpha(y_0) - \delta_{\beta\alpha}\right| \le C\epsilon_0\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\beta, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$;

(35) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{P}'_\alpha(y_0) - \delta_{\beta\alpha}\right| \le C\epsilon_0\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\beta, \alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$;

(36) $\left|\partial^\beta P'_\alpha(y_0)\right| \le C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$; and

(37) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{P}'_\alpha(y_0)\right| \le C\delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Next, we prove that there exists $\hat{P}^\# \in \mathcal{P}$ with the following properties:

(38) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^\# - P^0\right)(x_0) = 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$;

(39) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^\# - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq CM_0\delta^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$;

for a small enough controlled constant c_3, we have

(40) $\hat{P}^\# + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} s_\alpha M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P'_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} t_\alpha M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\hat{P}'_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$, whenever all $|s_\alpha|$, $|t_\alpha|$ are less than c_3.

Indeed, if $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$, then set $\hat{P}^\# = \hat{P}'$; then (38) holds vacuously, and (39), (40) simply restate (29), (26). Suppose $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$. We will pick coefficients $s^\#_\alpha$ $(\alpha \in \mathcal{A})$ for which

(41) $\hat{P}^\# := \hat{P}' + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} s^\#_\alpha M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}P'_\alpha$ satisfies (38), (39), (40).

In fact, with $\hat{P}^\#$ given by (41), equation (38) is equivalent to the system of the linear equations

(42) $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \left[\delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\partial^\beta P'_\alpha(x_0)\right] s^\#_\alpha = -M_0^{-1}\delta^{|\beta|-m}\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}' - P^0\right)(x_0)$ $(\beta \in \mathcal{A})$.

By (28), the right-hand side of (42) has absolute value at most $C\epsilon_0$. Hence, by (30) and the small ϵ_0 assumption (10), we can solve (42) for the $s^\#_\alpha$, and we have

(43) $\left|s^\#_\alpha\right| \leq C\epsilon_0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

The resulting $\hat{P}^\#$ given by (41) then satisfies (38). Moreover, for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^\# - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| &\leq \left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}' - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \left|s^\#_\alpha\right| \cdot M_0\delta^{m-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^\beta P'_\alpha(x_0)\right| \\ &\leq \left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}' - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| + C\epsilon_0\delta^{m-|\beta|}M_0,\end{aligned}$$

thanks to (32), (41), (43).

Therefore, (29) gives

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^\# - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq CM_0\delta^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } \beta \in \mathcal{M},$$

proving (39).

Finally, (40) follows at once from (26), (41), (43) and the small ϵ_0 assumption (10).

Thus, in all cases, there exists $\hat{P}^{\#}$ satisfying (38), (39), (40). We fix such a $\hat{P}^{\#}$.

Next, we produce an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ at $(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^{\#})$. To do so, we first suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$, and set

(44) $P_\gamma^{\#} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} b_{\gamma\alpha} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\alpha|} P'_\alpha$

for real coefficients $(b_{\gamma\alpha})_{\gamma,\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ to be picked below. For $\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\partial^\beta P_\gamma^{\#}(y_0) = \delta^{|\gamma|-|\beta|} \cdot \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} b_{\gamma\alpha} \left[\delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} \partial^\beta P'_\alpha(y_0) \right].$$

Thanks to (34) and the small ϵ_0 assumption (10), we may define $(b_{\gamma\alpha})_{\gamma,\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ as the inverse matrix of $\left(\delta^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} \partial^\beta P'_\alpha(y_0) \right)_{\alpha,\beta \in \mathcal{A}}$, and we then have

(45) $\partial^\beta P_\gamma^{\#}(y_0) = \delta_{\beta\gamma}$ $(\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{A})$

and

(46) $|b_{\gamma\alpha} - \delta_{\gamma\alpha}| \leq C\epsilon_0$ for $\gamma, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

In particular,

(47) $|b_{\gamma\alpha}| \leq C$,

and therefore for $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$ we have

(48)

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial^\beta P_\gamma^{\#}(y_0) \right| &\leq \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |b_{\gamma\alpha}| \, \delta^{|\gamma|-|\alpha|} \left| \partial^\beta P'_\alpha(y_0) \right| \\ &\leq C \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\alpha|} \delta^{|\alpha|-|\beta|} \leq C' \delta^{|\gamma|-|\beta|}, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (36).

Also, for $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\left[M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} P_\gamma^{\#} \right] = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} b_{\gamma\alpha} \cdot \left[M_0 \delta^{m-|\alpha|} P'_\alpha \right].$$

Therefore, for a small enough controlled constant c_4, we have

(49) $\hat{P}^{\#} + c_4 M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} P_\gamma^{\#},\ \hat{P}^{\#} - c_4 M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} P_\gamma^{\#} \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$,

thanks to (40). Since we are assuming that $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$, (49) implies that also

(50) $\hat{P}^{\#} \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$.

Our results (45), (48), (49), (50) tell us that $\left(P_\gamma^{\#}\right)_{\gamma\in\mathcal{A}}$ is an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ at $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^{\#}\right)$.

Thus, we have produced the desired $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C)$-basis, provided that $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$, then the existence of an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ at $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^{\#}\right)$ is equivalent to the assertion that

(51) $\hat{P}^{\#} \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$,

and (51) follows at once from (40). Thus, in all cases,

(52) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ has an $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C)$-basis at $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^{\#}\right)$.

Similarly, we can produce an $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ at $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^{\#}\right)$. We suppose first that $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$, and set

(53) $\hat{P}_\gamma^{\#} = \sum_{\alpha\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}} \hat{b}_{\beta\alpha} \delta^{|\gamma|-|\alpha|} \hat{P}'_\alpha$ for $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, with coefficients $\hat{b}_{\gamma\alpha}$ to be picked below.

Thanks to (35) and the *small* ϵ_0 *assumption* (10), we can pick the coefficients $\hat{b}_{\gamma\alpha}$ so that

(54) $\partial^\beta \hat{P}_\gamma^{\#}(y_0) = \delta_{\beta,\gamma}$ for $\beta, \gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$

and

(55) $\left|\hat{b}_{\gamma\alpha} - \delta_{\gamma\alpha}\right| \leq C\epsilon_0$ for $\gamma, \alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$,

hence

(56) $\left|\hat{b}_{\gamma\alpha}\right| \leq C$ for $\gamma, \alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

From (37), (53), (56), we obtain the estimate

(57) $\left|\partial^\beta \hat{P}_\gamma^{\#}(y_0)\right| \leq C\delta^{|\gamma|-|\beta|}$ for $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$,

in analogy with (48). Also for $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$, we have

$$M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} \hat{P}_\gamma^\# = \sum_{\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}} \hat{b}_{\gamma\alpha} \left[M_0 \delta^{m-|\alpha|} \hat{P}'_\alpha \right].$$

Together with (40) and (56), this tells us that

(58) $\hat{P}^\# + c_5 M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} \hat{P}_\gamma^\#,\ \hat{P}^\# - c_5 M_0 \delta^{m-|\gamma|} \hat{P}_\gamma^\# \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$ for $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}$

in analogy with (49). Since we are assuming that $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$, (58) implies that

(59) $\hat{P}^\# \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$.

Our results (54),(57), (58), (59) tell us that $\left(\hat{P}_\gamma^\#\right)_{\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}}$ is an $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ at $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^\#\right)$.

Thus, we have produced the desired $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C)$-basis, provided $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, if $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$, then the existence of an $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ at $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^\#\right)$ is equivalent to the assertion that

(60) $\hat{P}^\# \in \Gamma_{l_0-1}(y_0, CM_0)$,

and (60) follows at once from (40). Thus, in all cases,

(61) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \delta, C\right)$-basis at $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^\#\right)$.

Our results (52) and (61) together yield conclusion (6) of the Transport Lemma (Lemma 10). Also, our results (38) and (39) imply conclusions (7) and (8), since $\mathcal{A}$ is monotonic. (See (1).)

Thus, starting from assumptions (1)$\cdots$(5) and (9), (10), we have proven conclusions (6), (7), (8) for our $\hat{P}^\#$.

The proof of the Transport Lemma (Lemma 10) is complete. ■

For future reference, we state the special case of the Transport Lemma in which we take $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}$, $\hat{P}^0 = P^0$.

Corollary 1 *Let* $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be a shape field. For* $l \geq 1$*, let* $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be the* l*-th refinement of* $\vec{\Gamma}_0$*. Suppose*

(62) $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ *is monotonic.*

Let $x_0 \in E$, $M_0 > 0$, $l_0 \geq 1$, $\delta > 0, C_B > 0$*; and let* $P^0 \in \mathcal{P}$. *Assume that*

(63) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0}$ *has an* $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C_B)$*-basis at* $\left(x_0, M_0, P^0\right)$.

Let $y_0 \in E$, *and suppose that*

(64) $|x_0 - y_0| \leq \epsilon_0 \delta$, *where* ϵ_0 *is a small enough constant determined by* C_B, m, n.

Then there exists $\hat{P}^{\#} \in \mathcal{P}$ *with the following properties.*

(65) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l_0-1}$ *has an* $(\mathcal{A}, \delta, C'_B)$*-basis at* $\left(y_0, M_0, \hat{P}^{\#}\right)$, *with* C'_B *determined by* C_B, m, n.

(66) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^{\#} - P^0\right) \equiv 0$ *for* $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

(67) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^{\#} - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq C' M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|}$ *for all* $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, *with* C' *determined by* C_B, m, n.

Part II
The Main Lemma

II.1 Statement of the Main Lemma

For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ monotonic, we define

(1) $l(\mathcal{A}) = 1 + 3 \cdot \#\{\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{M} : \mathcal{A}' \text{ monotonic}, \mathcal{A}' < \mathcal{A}\}$.

Thus,

(2) $l(\mathcal{A}) - 3 \geq l(\mathcal{A}')$ for $\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ monotonic with $\mathcal{A}' < \mathcal{A}$.

By induction on $\mathcal{A}$ (with respect to the order relation $<$), we will prove the following result.

Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$ *Let* $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field, and for* $l \geq 1$, *let* $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be the* l*-th refinement of* $\vec{\Gamma}_0$. *Fix a dyadic cube* $Q_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, *a point* $x_0 \in E \cap 5(Q_0^+)$ *and a polynomial* $P^0 \in \mathcal{P}$, *as well as positive real numbers* M_0, ϵ, C_B. *We make the following assumptions.*

(A1) $\vec{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{l}(\mathcal{A})}$ *has an* $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}, C_B\right)$*-basis at* $\left(x_0, M_0, P^0\right)$.

(A2) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$.

(A3) ("Small ϵ Assumption") ϵ *is less than a small enough constant determined by* C_B, C_w, m, n.

Then there exists $F \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q_0\right)$ *satisfying the following conditions.*

(C1) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(F - P^0\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ *on* $\frac{65}{64}Q_0$ *for* $|\beta| \leq m$, *where* $C(\epsilon)$ *is determined by* ϵ, C_B, C_w, m, n.

(C2) $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, C'(\epsilon) M_0)$ *for all* $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0$, *where* $C'(\epsilon)$ *is determined by* ϵ, C_B, C_w, m, n.

Remark *We state the Main Lemma only for monotonic* $\mathcal{A}$.

Note that x_0 may fail to belong to $\frac{65}{64}Q_0$, hence the assertion $J_{x_0}(F) = P^0$ may be meaningless. Even if $x_0 \in \frac{65}{64}Q_0$, we do not assert that $J_{x_0}(F) = P^0$.

II.2 The Base Case

The base case of our induction on $\mathcal{A}$ is the case $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{M}$.

In this section, we prove the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{M}$. The hypotheses of the lemma are as follows:

(1) $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ is a $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$-convex shape field.

(2) $\vec{\Gamma}_1 = (\Gamma_1(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ is the first refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}_0$.

(3) $\vec{\Gamma}_1$ has an $\left(\mathcal{M}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}, C_B\right)$-basis at $\left(x_0, M_0, P^0\right)$.

(4) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$.

(5) ϵ is less than a small enough constant determined by C_B, C_w, m, n.

(6) $x_0 \in 5(Q_0)^+ \cap E$.

We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by C_B, C_W, m, n. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences.

(7) Let $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64} Q_0$.

Then (6), (7) imply that

(8) $|z - x_0| \le C\delta_{Q_0} = C\epsilon \cdot \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)$.

From (1), (2), (3), (5), (8), and Corollary 1 in Section I.4, we obtain a polynomial $\hat{P}^{\#} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

(9) $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ has an $\left(\mathcal{M}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}, C'\right)$-basis at $\left(z, M_0, \hat{P}^{\#}\right)$, and

(10) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^{\#} - P^0\right) = 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

From (9), we have $\hat{P}^{\#} \in \Gamma_0(z, C'M_0)$, while (10) tells us that $\hat{P}^{\#} = P^0$. Thus,

(11) $P^0 \in \Gamma_0\left(z, C'M_0\right)$ for all $z \in \frac{65}{64} Q_0 \cap E$.

Consequently, the function $F := P^0$ on $\frac{65}{64} Q_0$ satisfies the conclusions (C1), (C2) of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{M}$.

This completes the proof of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{M}$. ■

II.3 Setup for the Induction Step

Fix a monotonic set $\mathcal{A}$ strictly contained in $\mathcal{M}$, and assume the following

(1) Induction Hypothesis: The Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}'$ holds for all monotonic $\mathcal{A}' < \mathcal{A}$.

Under this assumption, we will prove the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$. Thus, let $\vec{\Gamma}_0$, $\vec{\Gamma}_l$ $(l \ge 1)$, C_w, $\delta_{\max}$, Q_0, x_0, P^0, M_0, ϵ, C_B be as in the hypotheses of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$. Our goal is to prove the existence of $F \in C^m(\frac{65}{64} Q_0)$ satisfying conditions (C1) and (C2). To do so, we introduce a constant $A \ge 1$, and make the following additional assumptions.

(2) Large A assumption: A exceeds a large enough constant determined by C_B, C_w, m, n.

(3) Small ϵ assumption: ϵ is less than a small enough constant determined by A, C_B, C_w, m, n.

We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by C_B, C_w, m, n. Also we write $c(A)$, $C(A)$, $C'(A)$, etc., to denote constants determined by A, C_B, C_W, m, n. Similarly, we write $C(\epsilon)$, $c(\epsilon)$, $C'(\epsilon)$, etc., to denote constants determined by ϵ, A, C_B, C_w, m, n. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences.

In place of (C1), (C2), we will prove the existence of a function $F \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q_0\right)$ satisfying

(C*1) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(F - P^0\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q_0$ for $|\beta| \leq \mathcal{M}$; and

(C*2) $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, C(\epsilon) M_0)$ for all $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0$.

Conditions (C*1), (C*2) differ from (C1), (C2) in that the constants in (C*1), (C*2) may depend on A.

Once we establish (C*1) and (C*2), we may fix A to be a constant determined by C_B, C_w, m, n, large enough to satisfy the Large A Assumption (2). The Small ϵ Assumption (3) will then follow from the Small ϵ Assumption (A3) in the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$; and the desired conclusions (C1), (C2) will then follow from (C*1), (C*2).

Thus, our goal is to prove the existence of $F \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q_0\right)$ satisfying (C*1) and (C*2), assuming (1), (2), (3) above, along with hypotheses of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$. This will complete our induction on $\mathcal{A}$ and establish the Main Lemma for all monotonic subsets of $\mathcal{M}$.

II.4 Calderón-Zygmund Decomposition

We place ourselves in the setting of Section II.3. Let Q be a dyadic cube. We say that Q is "OK" if (1) and (2) below are satisfied.

(1) $5Q \subseteq 5Q_0$.

(2) Either $\#(E \cap 5Q) \leq 1$ or there exists $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality) for which the following holds:

(3) For each $y \in E \cap 5Q$ there exists $\hat{P}^y \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying

(3a) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has a weak $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, A\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, \hat{P}^y\right)$.

(3b) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\hat{P}^y - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq AM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

(3c) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^y - P^0\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

Remark *The argument in this section and the next will depend sensitively on several details of the above definition. Note that (3a) involves* $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ *rather than* $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\hat{\mathcal{A}})}$*, and that (3b) involves* x_0*,* δ_{Q_0} *rather than* y*,* δ_Q*. Note also that the set* $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ *in* (2)*,* (3) *needn't be monotonic.*

A dyadic cube Q will be called a Calderón-Zygmund cube (or a CZ cube) if it is OK, but no dyadic cube strictly containing Q is OK.

Recall that given any two distinct dyadic cubes Q, Q', either Q is strictly contained in Q', or Q' is strictly contained in Q, or $Q \cap Q' = \emptyset$. The first two alternatives here are ruled out if Q, Q' are CZ cubes. Hence, the Calderón-Zygmund cubes are pairwise disjoint.

Any CZ cube Q satisfies (1) and is therefore contained in the interior of $5Q_0$. On the other hand, let x be an interior point of $5Q_0$. Then any sufficiently small dyadic cube Q containing x satisfies $5Q \subset 5Q_0$ and $\#(E \cap 5Q) \leq 1$; hence, Q is OK. However, any sufficiently large dyadic cube Q containing x will fail to satisfy $5Q \subseteq 5Q_0$; hence Q is not OK. It follows that x is contained in a maximal OK dyadic cube. Thus, we have proven

Lemma 11 *The CZ cubes form a partition of the interior of* $5Q_0$*.*

Next, we establish

Lemma 12 *Let* Q*,* Q' *be CZ cubes. If* $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$*, then* $\frac{1}{2}\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q'} \leq 2\delta_Q$*.*

Proof. Suppose not. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\delta_Q \leq \frac{1}{4}\delta_{Q'}$. Then $\delta_{Q^+} \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta_{Q'}$, and $\frac{65}{64}Q^+ \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$; hence, $5Q^+ \subset 5Q'$. The cube Q' is OK. Therefore,

(4) $5Q^+ \subset 5Q' \subseteq 5Q_0$.

If $\#(E \cap 5Q') \leq 1$, then also $\#(E \cap 5Q^+) \leq 1$. Otherwise, there exists $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ such that for each $y \in E \cap 5Q'$ there exists $\hat{P}^y \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying

(5) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has a weak $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q'}, A\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, \hat{P}^y\right)$,

(6) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^y - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq AM_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, and

(7) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P}^y - P^0\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

For each $y \in E \cap 5Q^+ \subseteq E \cap 5Q'$, the above $\hat{P}^y$ satisfies (6), (7); and (5) implies

(8) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has a weak $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q^+}, A\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, \hat{P}^y\right)$

because $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q^+} < \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q'}$, and because (5), (8) deal with weak bases. Thus, (4) holds, and either $\#(E \cap 5Q^+) \leq 1$ or else our $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ and $\hat{P}^y$ $(y \in E \cap 5Q^+)$ satisfy (6), (7), (8). This tells us that Q^+ is OK. However, Q^+ strictly contains the CZ cube Q; therefore, Q^+ cannot be OK. This contradiction completes the proof of Lemma 12. ■

Note that the proof of Lemma 12 made use of our decision to involve x_0, δ_{Q_0} rather than y, δ_Q in (3b), as well as our decision to use weak bases in (3a).

Lemma 13 *Only finitely many CZ cubes Q satisfy the condition*

(9) $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. There exists some small positive number δ_* such that any dyadic cube Q satisfying (9) and $\delta_Q \leq \delta_*$ must satisfy also $5Q \subset 5Q_0$ and $\#(E \cap 5Q) \leq 1$. (Here we use the finiteness of E.)

Consequently, any CZ cube Q satisfying (9) must have sidelength $\delta_Q \geq \delta_*$ (and also $\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q_0}$ since $5Q \subset 5Q_0$ because Q is OK). There are only finitely many dyadic cubes Q satisfying both (9) and $\delta_* \leq \delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q_0}$.

The proof of Lemma 13 is complete. ■

II.5 Auxiliary Polynomials

We again place ourselves in the setting of Section II.3 and we make use of the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition defined in Section II.4.

Recall that $x_0 \in E \cap 5Q_0^+$, and that $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})}$ has an $(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}, C_B)$-basis at (x_0, M_0, P^0); moreover, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is monotonic, and ϵ is less than a small enough constant determined by C_B, C_w, m, n.

Let $y \in E \cap 5Q_0$. Then $|x_0 - y| \leq C\delta_{Q_0} = (C\epsilon)(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0})$. Hence, by Corollary 1 in Section I.4, there exists $P^y \in \mathcal{P}$ with the following properties.

(1) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}, C\right)$-basis $\left(P^y_\alpha\right)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ at (y, M_0, P^y),

(2) $\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y}-P^{0}\right)\equiv 0$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{A}$,

(3) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y}-P^{0}\right)(x_{0})\right|\leq CM_{0}\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_{0}}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$.

We fix P^{y},P_{α}^{y} $(\alpha\in\mathcal{A})$ as above for each $y\in E\cap 5Q_{0}$. We study the relationship between the polynomials P^{y},P_{α}^{y} $(\alpha\in\mathcal{A})$ and the Calderón-Zygmund decomposition.

Lemma 14 ("Controlled Auxiliary Polynomials") *Let $Q\in CZ$, and suppose that*

(4) $\frac{65}{64}Q\cap\frac{65}{64}Q_{0}\neq\emptyset$.

Let

(5) $y\in E\cap 5Q_{0}\cap 5Q^{+}$.

Then

(6) $\left|\partial^{\beta}P_{\alpha}^{y}(y)\right|\leq C\cdot\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q}\right)^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ *for* $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$, $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Let $K\geq 1$ be a large enough constant to be picked below and assume that

(7) $\max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\beta\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q}\right)^{|\beta|-|\alpha|}\left|\partial^{\beta}P_{\alpha}^{y}(y)\right|>K$.

We will derive a contradiction.
Thanks to (1), we have

(8) $P^{y},P^{y}\pm CM_{0}\cdot\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_{0}}\right)^{m-|\alpha|}P_{\alpha}^{y}\in\Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}(y,CM_{0})$ for $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$,

(9) $\partial^{\beta}P_{\alpha}^{y}(y)=\delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for $\beta,\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$,

and

(10) $\left|\partial^{\beta}P_{\alpha}^{y}(y)\right|\leq C\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_{0}}\right)^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$, $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$.

Also,

(11) $5Q\subset 5Q_{0}$ since Q is OK.

If $\delta_Q \geq 2^{-12}\delta_{Q_0}$, then from (10), (11), we would have

(12) $\max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\beta\in\mathcal{M}} \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} \left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha^y(y)\right| \leq C'$.

We will pick

(13) $K > C'$, with C' as in (12).

Then (12) contradicts our assumption (7).
Thus, we must have

(14) $\delta_Q < 2^{-12}\delta_{Q_0}$.

Let

(15) $Q = \hat{Q}_0 \subset \hat{Q}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \hat{Q}_{\nu_{\max}}$ be all the dyadic cubes containing Q and having sidelength at most $2^{-10}\delta_{Q_0}$.

Then

(16) $\hat{Q}_0 = Q$, $\delta_{\hat{Q}_{\nu_{\max}}} = 2^{-10}\delta_{Q_0}$, $\hat{Q}_{\nu+1} = \left(\hat{Q}_\nu\right)^+$ for $0 \leq \nu \leq \nu_{\max} - 1$, and $\nu_{\max} \geq 2$.

For $1 \leq \nu \leq \nu_{\max}$, we define

(17) $X_\nu = \max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\beta\in\mathcal{M}} \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\hat{Q}_\nu}\right)^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} \left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha^y(y)\right|$.

From (7) and (10), we have

(18) $X_0 > K$, $X_{\nu_{\max}} \leq C'$,

and from (16), (17), we have

(19) $2^{-m}X_\nu \leq X_{\nu+1} \leq 2^m X_\nu$, for $0 \leq \nu \leq \nu_{\max}$.

We will pick

(20) $K > C'$ with C' as in (18).

Then $\tilde{\nu} := \min\{\nu : X_\nu \leq K\}$ and $\tilde{Q} = \hat{Q}_{\tilde{\nu}}$ satisfy the following, thanks to (18), (19), (20): $\tilde{\nu} \neq 0$, hence

(21) $\tilde{Q}$ is a dyadic cube strictly containing Q; also $2^{-m}K \le X_{\tilde{v}} \le K$,

hence

(22) $2^{-m}K \le \max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A},\beta\in\mathcal{M}} \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}\right)^{|\beta|-|\alpha|} \left|\partial^{\beta} P^{y}_{\alpha}(y)\right| \le K$.

Also, since $Q \subset \tilde{Q}$, we have $\frac{65}{64}\tilde{Q} \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$ by (4); and since $\delta_{\tilde{Q}} \le 2^{-10}\delta_{Q_0}$, we conclude that

(23) $5\tilde{Q} \subset 5Q_0$.

From (8), (10), and (23), we have

(24) $P^{y}, P^{y} \pm cM_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}\right)^{m-|\alpha|} P^{y}_{\alpha} \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}(y, CM_0) \subset \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}(y, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$;

and

(25) $\left|\partial^{\beta} P^{y}_{\alpha}(y)\right| \le C\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}\right)^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\beta \ge \alpha$.

Our results (9), (24), (25) tell us that

(26) $\left(P^{y}_{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ is a weak $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}, C\right)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ at (y, M_0, P^{y}).

Note also that

(27) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}} \le \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \le \delta_{\max}$, by (23) and hypothesis (A2) of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$.

Moreover,

(28) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ is $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex, thanks to Lemma 5 (B).

If we take

(29) $K \ge C^{*}$ for a large enough C^{*},

then (22), (26)$\cdots$(29) and the Relabeling Lemma (Lemma 8) produce a monotonic set $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{M}$, such that

(30) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality)

and

(31) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}, C\right)$-basis at (y, M_0, P^y).

Also, from (9), (22), (24), we see that

(32) $\left(P^y_\alpha\right)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ is an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}, CK\right)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ at (y, M_0, P^y).

We now pick

(33) $K = \hat{C}$ (a constant determined by C_B, C_w, m, n), with $\hat{C} \geq 1$ large enough to satisfy (13), (20), (29).

Then (31) and (32) tell us that

(34) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ has both an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}, C\right)$-basis and an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}, C\right)$-basis at (y, M_0, P^y).

Let $z \in E \cap 5\tilde{Q}$. Then $z, y \in 5\tilde{Q}^+$, hence

(35) $|z-y| \leq C\delta_{\tilde{Q}} = C\epsilon \cdot \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}\right)$.

From (34), (35), the Small ϵ Assumption and Lemma 10 (and our hypothesis that $\mathcal{A}$ is monotonic; see Section II.3), we obtain a polynomial $\check{P}^z \in \mathcal{P}$, such that

(36) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}, C\right)$-basis at $\left(z, M_0, \check{P}^z\right)$,

(37) $\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^y\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$,

and

(38) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^y\right)(y)\right| \leq CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

From (23) and (38), we have

(39) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^y\right)(y)\right| \leq CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Since $y \in 5Q_0$ by hypothesis of Lemma 14, while $x_0 \in 5Q_0^+$ by hypothesis of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$, we have $|x_0 - y| \leq C\delta_{Q_0}$, and therefore (39) implies that

(40) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^y\right)(x_0)\right| \le CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

From (2), (3), (37), (40), we now have

(41) $\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^0\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$

and

(42) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \le CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Our results (36), (41), (42) hold for every $z \in E \cap 5\tilde{Q}$.

We recall the Large A Assumption in the Section II.3. Then (23), (30), (36), (41), (42) yield the following results: $5\tilde{Q} \subset 5Q_0$, $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality).

For every $z \in E \cap 5\tilde{Q}$, there exists $\check{P}^z \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

- $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{\tilde{Q}}, A\right)$-basis at $\left(z, M_0, \check{P}^z\right)$.
- $\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^0\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.
- $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \le AM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Comparing the above results with the definition of an OK cube, we conclude that $\tilde{Q}$ is OK.

However, since $\tilde{Q}$ properly contains the CZ cube Q, (see (21)), $\tilde{Q}$ cannot be OK.

This contradiction proves that our assumption (7) must be false.

Thus, $\left|\partial^\beta P_\alpha^y(y)\right| \le K\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Since we picked $K = \hat{C}$ in (33), this implies the estimate (6), completing the proof of Lemma 14. ■

Corollary 2 *Let $Q \in$ CZ, and suppose $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$. Let $y \in E \cap 5Q_0 \cap 5Q^+$. Then $\left(P_\alpha^y\right)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ is an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C\right)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}$ at $\left(y, M_0, P^y\right)$.*

Proof. From (1) we have

(43) $P^y, P^y \pm cM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\alpha|} P_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}(y, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$;

and

(44) $\partial^{\beta} P_{\alpha}^{y}(y) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$ for $\beta, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

Since $5Q \subseteq 5Q_0$ (because Q is OK), we have $\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q_0}$, and (43) implies

(45) $P^y, P^y \pm cM_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\alpha|} P_\alpha \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}(y, CM_0)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 14 tells us that

(46) $\left|\partial^{\beta} P_{\alpha}^{y}(y)\right| \leq C\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

From (44), (45), (46), we conclude that $(P_\alpha^y)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ is an $(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C)$-basis for $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}$ at (y, M_0, P^y), completing the proof of Corollary 2. ■

Lemma 15 ("Consistency of Auxiliary Polynomials") *Let* $Q, Q' \in CZ$, *with*

(47) $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$, $\frac{65}{64}Q' \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$

and

(48) $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$.

Let

(49) $y \in E \cap 5Q_0 \cap 5Q^+$, $y' \in E \cap 5Q_0 \cap 5(Q')^+$.

Then

(50) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^y - P^{y'}\right)(y')\right| \leq CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Suppose first that $\delta_Q \geq 2^{-20}\delta_{Q_0}$. Then (3) (applied to y and to y') tells us that

$$\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^y - P^{y'}\right)(x_0)\right| \leq CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } \beta \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Hence, $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^y - P^{y'}\right)(y')\right| \leq C'M_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|} \leq C''M_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, since $x_0, y' \in 5Q_0^+$. Thus, (50) holds if $\delta_Q \geq 2^{-20}\delta_{Q_0}$. Suppose

(51) $\delta_Q < 2^{-20}\delta_{Q_0}$.

By (48) and Lemma 12, we have

(52) $\delta_Q, \delta_{Q'} \leq 2^{-20}\delta_{Q_0}$ and $\frac{1}{2}\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q'} \leq 2\delta_Q$.

Together with (47), this implies that

(53) $5Q^+, 5\left(Q'\right)^+ \subseteq 5Q_0$.

From Corollary 2, we have

(54) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q'}, C\right)$-basis at $\left(y', M_0, P^{y'}\right)$.

From (48), (49), (52), we have

(55) $|y - y'| \leq C\delta_{Q'} = C\epsilon\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q'}\right)$.

We recall from (52) and the hypotheses of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$ that

(56) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q'} \leq \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$,

and we recall from Section II.3 that

(57) $\mathcal{A}$ is monotonic.

Thanks to (54)$\cdots$(57), Corollary 1 in Section I.4 produces a polynomial $P' \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

(58) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q'}, C\right)$-basis at (y, M_0, P');

(59) $\partial^\beta\left(P' - P^{y'}\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$;

and

(60) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(P' - P^{y'}\right)(y')\right| \leq CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q'}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

From (58) we have in particular that

(61) $P' \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}(y, CM_0)$,

and from (60) and (52) we obtain

(62) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y'}-P'\right)(y')\right| \leq CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

If we knew that

(63) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y}-P'\right)(y)\right| \leq M_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$,

then also $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y}-P'\right)(y')\right| \leq C'M_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$ since $|y-y'| \leq C\delta_Q$ thanks to (48), (49), (52). Consequently, by (62), we would have $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y'}-P^{y}\right)(y')\right| \leq CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, which is our desired inequality (50). Thus, Lemma 15 will follow if we can prove (63).

Suppose (63) fails.

Corollary 2 shows that $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C\right)$-basis at (y, M_0, P^y). Since $\Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}(x, M) \subset \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}(x, M)$ for all $x \in E$, $M > 0$, it follows that

(64) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C\right)$-basis at (y, M_0, P^y).

From (59) and (2) (applied to y and y'), we see that

(65) $\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y}-P'\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

Since we are assuming that (63) fails, we have

(66) $\max_{\beta\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{|\beta|}\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y}-P'\right)(y)\right| \geq M_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m}$.

Also, from (52) and the hypotheses of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$, we have

(67) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q < \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$.

From Lemma 5 (B), we know that

(68) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ is $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex.

Our results (61), (64)$\cdots$(68) and Lemma 9 produce a set $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and a polynomial $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{P}$, with the following properties:

(69) $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is monotonic;

(70) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality);

(71) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-2}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, \hat{P}\right)$;

(72) $\partial^\beta\left(\hat{P}-P^y\right)\equiv 0$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{A}$ (recall, $\mathcal{A}$ is monotonic);

and

(73) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\hat{P}-P^y\right)(y)\right|\le CM\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$.

Now let $z\in E\cap 5Q^+$. We recall that $\mathcal{A}$ is monotonic, and that (64), (65), (71), (72), (73) hold. Moreover, since $y,z\in 5Q^+$, we have $|y-z|\le C\delta_Q = C\epsilon\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)$. Thanks to the above remarks and the Small ϵ Assumption, we may apply Lemma 10 to produce $\check{P}^z\in\mathcal{P}$ satisfying the following conditions.

(74) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}},\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q,C\right)$-basis at $\left(z,M_0,\check{P}^z\right)$.

(75) $\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^y\right)\equiv 0$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{A}$.

(76) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^y\right)(y)\right|\le CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$.

By (74), and the Large A Assumption,

(77) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}},\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q^+},A\right)$-basis at $\left(z,M_0,\check{P}^z\right)$.

By (2) and (75), we have

(78) $\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^0\right)\equiv 0$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{A}$.

By (52) and (76), we have $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^y\right)(y)\right|\le CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$, hence $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^y\right)(x_0)\right|\le CM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$, since $x,y\in 5Q_0^+$. Together with (3) and the Large A Assumption, this yields the estimate

(79) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^0\right)(x_0)\right|\le AM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$.

We have proven (77), (78), (79) for each $z\in E\cap 5Q^+$. Thus, $5Q^+\subset 5Q_0$ (see (53)), $\hat{\mathcal{A}}<\mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality; see (70)), and for each $z\in E\cap 5Q^+$ there exists $\check{P}^z\in\mathcal{P}$ such that

- $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}},\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q^+},A\right)$-basis at $\left(z,M_0,\check{P}^z\right)$;
- $\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^0\right)\equiv 0$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{A}$; and
- $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\check{P}^z-P^0\right)(x_0)\right|\le AM_0\left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta\in\mathcal{M}$. (See (77), (78), (79).)

Comparing the above results with the definition of an OK cube, we see that Q^+ is OK. On the other hand Q^+ cannot be OK, since it properly contains the CZ cube Q. Assuming that (63) fails, we have derived a contradiction. Thus, (63) holds, completing the proof of Lemma 15. ■

II.6 Good News About CZ Cubes

In this section we again place ourselves in the setting of Section II.3, and we make use of the auxiliary polynomials P^y and the CZ cubes Q defined above.

Lemma 16 *Let $Q \in CZ$, with*

(1) $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$

and

(2) $\#(E \cap 5Q) \geq 2$.

Let

(3) $y \in E \cap 5Q$.

Then there exist a set $\mathcal{A}^\# \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and a polynomial $P^\# \in \mathcal{P}$ with the following properties.

(4) $\mathcal{A}^\#$ is monotonic.

(5) $\mathcal{A}^\# < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality).

(6) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}^\#, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C(A)\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, P^\#\right)$.

(7) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^\# - P^y\right)(y)\right| \leq C(A) M_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Recall that

(8) $\partial^\beta \left(P^y - P^0\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$ (see (2) in Section II.5)

and that

(9) $5Q \subseteq 5Q_0$, since Q is OK.

Thanks to (3) and (9), Corollary 2 in Section II.5 applies, and it tells us that

(10) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C\right)$-basis at (y, M_0, P^y).

On the other hand, Q is OK and $\#(E \cap 5Q) \geq 2$; hence, there exist $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ with the following properties

(11) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has a weak $\left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, A\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, \hat{P}\right)$.

(12) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P} - P^0\right)(x_0)\right| \leq AM_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

(13) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P} - P^0\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

(14) $\hat{\mathcal{A}} < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality).

We consider separately two cases.
Case 1: Suppose that

(15) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P} - P^y\right)(y)\right| \leq M_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

By Lemma 5 (B),

(16) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ is $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex.

Also, (9) and hypothesis (A2) of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$ give

(17) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q \leq \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$.

Applying (11), (16), (17), and Lemma 8, we obtain a set $\mathcal{A}^\# \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ such that

(18) $\mathcal{A}^\# \leq \hat{\mathcal{A}}$,

(19) $\mathcal{A}^\#$ is monotonic,

and

(20) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}^\#, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C(A)\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, \hat{P}\right)$.

Setting $P^\# = \hat{P}$, we obtain the desired conclusions $(4)\cdots(7)$ at once from (14), (15), (18), (19), and (20).

Thus, Lemma 16 holds in Case 1.

Case 2: Suppose that $\left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P} - P^y\right)(y)\right| > M_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{m-|\beta|}$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, i.e.,

(21) $\max_{\beta\in\mathcal{M}} \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^{|\beta|} \left|\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P} - P^y\right)(y)\right| > M_0 \left(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q\right)^m$.

From (11) we have

(22) $\hat{P} \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}(y, AM_0)$

Since $\Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}(x, M) \subseteq \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}(x, M)$ for all $x \in E, M > 0$, (10) implies that

(23) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C\right)$-basis at (y, M_0, P^y).

As in Case 1,

(24) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ is $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex,

and

(25) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q \leq \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$.

From (8) and (13) we have

(26) $\partial^\beta \left(\hat{P} - P^y\right) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$.

Thanks to (21)$\cdots$(26) and Lemma 9 there exist $\mathcal{A}^\# \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and $P^\# \in \mathcal{P}$ with the following properties: $\mathcal{A}^\#$ is monotonic; $\mathcal{A}^\# < \mathcal{A}$ (strict inequality); $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A})-3}$ has an $(\mathcal{A}^\#, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C(A))$-basis at $(y, M_0, P^\#)$; $\partial^\beta(P^\# - P^y) \equiv 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$; $|\partial^\beta(P^\# - P^y)(y)| \leq M_0(\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q)^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$.

Thus, $\mathcal{A}^\#$ and $P^\#$ satisfy (4)$\cdots$(7), proving Lemma 16 in Case 2.

We have seen that Lemma 16 holds in all cases. ■

Remarks

- *The analysis of Case 2 in the proof of Lemma 16 is a new ingredient, with no analogue in our previous work on Whitney problems.*
- *The proof of Lemma 16 gives a* $\hat{P}$ *that satisfies also* $\partial^\beta(\hat{P} - P^0) \equiv 0$ *for* $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$*, but we make no use of that.*
- *Note that* x_0 *and* δ_{Q_0} *appear in* (12)*, rather than the desired* y, δ_Q*. Consequently,* (12) *is of no help in the proof of Lemma 16.*

In the proof of our next result, we use our Induction Hypothesis that the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}'$ holds whenever $\mathcal{A}' < \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ is monotonic. (See Section II.3.)

Lemma 17 *Let* $Q \in CZ$. *Suppose that*

(27) $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$

and

(28) $\#(E \cap 5Q) \geq 2$.

Let

(29) $y \in E \cap 5Q$.

Then there exists $F^{y,Q} \in C^m(\frac{65}{64}Q)$ *such that*

*(*1)* $\left|\partial^\beta \left(F^{y,Q} - P^y\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ *on* $\frac{65}{64}Q$, *for* $|\beta| \leq m$; *and*

*(*2)* $J_z\left(F^{y,Q}\right) \in \Gamma_0(z, C(\epsilon) M_0)$ *for all* $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q$.

Proof. Our hypotheses (27), (28), (29) are precisely the hypotheses of Lemma 16. Let $\mathcal{A}^\#$, $P^\#$ satisfy the conclusions $(4)\cdots(7)$ of that Lemma. Recall the definition of $l(\mathcal{A})$; see (1), (2) in Section II.1. We have $l(\mathcal{A}^\#) \leq l(\mathcal{A}) - 3$ since $\mathcal{A}^\# < \mathcal{A}$; hence (6) implies that

(30) $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\mathcal{A}^\#)}$ has an $\left(\mathcal{A}^\#, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q, C(A)\right)$-basis at $\left(y, M_0, P^\#\right)$.

Also, since Q is OK, we have $5Q \subseteq 5Q_0$, hence $\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q_0}$. Hence, hypothesis (A2) of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$ implies that

(31) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q \leq \delta_{\max}$.

By (4), (5), and our Inductive Hypothesis, the Main Lemma holds for $\mathcal{A}^\#$. Thanks to (29), (30), (31) and the Small ϵ Assumption in Section II.3, the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}^\#$ now yields a function $F \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q\right)$, such that

(32) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(F - P^\#\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q$, for $|\beta| \leq m$; and

(33) $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, C(\epsilon) M_0)$ for all $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q$.

Thanks to conclusion (7) of Lemma 16; (together with (29)), we have also

(34) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^\# - P^y\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q$ for $|\beta| \leq m$.

(Recall that $P^\# - P^y$ is a polynomial of degree at most $m-1$.) Taking $F^{y,Q} = F$, we may read off the desired conclusions (*1) and (*2) from (32), (33), (34).

The proof of Lemma 17 is complete. ■

II.7 Local Interpolants

In this section, we again place ourselves in the setting of Section II.3. We make use of the Calderón-Zygmund cubes Q and the auxiliary polynomials P^y defined above. Let

(1) $\mathcal{Q} = \left\{Q \in CZ : \frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset\right\}$.

For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we define a function $F^Q \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q\right)$ and a polynomial $P^Q \in \mathcal{P}$. We proceed by cases. We say that $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ is

Type 1 if $\#(E \cap 5Q) \geq 2$,

Type 2 if $\#(E \cap 5Q) = 1$,

Type 3 if $\#(E \cap 5Q) = 0$ and $\delta_Q \leq \frac{1}{1024}\delta_{Q_0}$, and

Type 4 if $\#(E \cap 5Q) = 0$ and $\delta_Q > \frac{1}{1024}\delta_{Q_0}$.

If Q is of Type 1, then we pick a point $y_Q \in E \cap 5Q$, and set $P^Q = P^{y_Q}$. Applying Lemma 17, we obtain a function $F^Q \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q\right)$ such that

(2) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(F^Q - P^Q\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q$, for $|\beta| \leq m$; and

(3) $J_z\left(F^Q\right) \in \Gamma_0(z, C(\epsilon) M_0)$ for all $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q$.

If Q is of Type 2, then we let y_Q be the one and only point of $E \cap 5Q$, and define $F^Q = P^Q = P^{y_Q}$. Then (2) holds trivially. If $y_Q \notin \frac{65}{64}Q$ then (3) holds vacuously.

If $y_Q \in \frac{65}{64}Q$, then (3) asserts that $P^{y_Q} \in \Gamma_0(y_Q, C(\epsilon) M_0)$. Thanks to (2) in Section II.5, we know that $P^{y_Q} \in \Gamma_{l(\mathcal{A})-1}(y_Q, CM_0) \subset \Gamma_0(y_Q, C(\epsilon) M_0)$. Thus, (2) and (3) hold also when Q is of Type 2.

If Q is of Type 3, then $5Q^+ \subset 5Q_0$, since $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\delta_Q \leq \frac{1}{1024}\delta_{Q_0}$. However, Q^+ cannot be OK, since Q is a CZ cube. Therefore $\#(E \cap 5Q^+) \geq 2$. We pick $y_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+$, and set $F^Q = P^Q = P^{y_Q}$. Then (2) holds trivially, and (3) holds vacuously.

If Q is of Type 4, then we set $F^Q = P^Q = P^0$, and again (2) holds trivially, and (3) holds vacuously.

Note that if Q is of Type 1, 2, or 3, then we have defined a point y_Q, and we have $P^Q = P^{y_Q}$ and

(4) $y_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+ \cap 5Q_0$.

(If Q is of Type 1 or 2, then $y_Q \in E \cap 5Q$ and $5Q \subseteq 5Q_0$ since Q is OK. If Q is of Type 3, then $y_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+$ and $5Q^+ \subset 5Q_0$). We have picked F^Q and P^Q for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, and (2), (3) hold in all cases.

Lemma 18 ("Consistency of the P^Q") *Let $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$, and suppose $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$. Then*

(5) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^Q - P^{Q'}\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ *on* $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$, *for* $|\beta| \leq m$.

Proof. Suppose first that neither Q nor Q' is Type 4. Then $P^Q = P^{y_Q}$ and $P^{Q'} = P^{y_{Q'}}$ with $y_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+ \cap 5Q_0$, $y_{Q'} \in E \cap 5(Q')^+ \cap 5Q_0$. Thanks to Lemma 15, we have

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^Q - P^{Q'}\right)(y_Q)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } \beta \in \mathcal{M},$$

which implies (5), since $y_Q \in 5Q^+$ and $P^Q - P^{Q'}$ is an $(m-1)^{rst}$ degree polynomial.

Next, suppose that Q and Q' are both Type 4.

Then by definition $P^Q = P^{Q'} = P^0$, and consequently (5) holds trivially.

Finally, suppose that exactly one of Q, Q' is of Type 4.

Since δ_Q and $\delta_{Q'}$, differ by at most a factor of 2, the cubes Q and Q' may be interchanged without loss of generality. Hence, we may assume that Q' is of Type 4 and Q is not. By definition of Type 4,

(6) $\delta_{Q'} > \frac{1}{1024}\delta_{Q_0}$; hence also $\delta_Q \geq \frac{1}{1024}\delta_{Q_0}$,

since δ_Q, $\delta_{Q'}$, are powers of 2 that differ by at most a factor of 2.

Since Q' is of Type 4 and Q is not, we have $P^Q = P^{y_Q}$ and $P^{Q'} = P^0$, with

(7) $y_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+ \cap 5Q_0$.

Thus, in this case, (5) asserts that

(8) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^{y_Q} - P^0\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$, for $|\beta| \leq m$.

However, by (7) above, property (3) in Section II.5 gives the estimate

(9) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y_Q}-P^{0}\right)(x_0)\right| \le C(\epsilon)\, M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m-1$.

Recall from the hypotheses of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$ that $x_0 \in 5(Q_0)^+$. Since $P^{y_Q}-P^0$ is an $(m-1)^{rst}$ degree polynomial, we conclude from (9) that

(10) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{y_Q}-P^{0}\right)\right| \le C(\epsilon)\, M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ on $5Q$, for $|\beta| \le m$.

The desired inequality (8) now follows from (6) and (10). Thus, (5) holds in all cases.

The proof of Lemma 18 is complete. ■

From estimate (2), Lemma 18, and Lemma 12, we immediately obtain the following.

Corollary 3 *Let $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$ and suppose that $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$. Then*

(11) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(F^{Q}-F^{Q'}\right)\right| \le C(\epsilon)\, M_0 \delta_{Q}^{m-|\beta|}$ *on* $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$, *for* $|\beta| \le m$.

Regarding the polynomials P^Q, we make the following simple observation.

Lemma 19 *We have*

(12) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{Q}-P^{0}\right)\right| \le C(\epsilon)\, M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ *on* $\frac{65}{64}Q$, *for* $|\beta| \le m$ *and* $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. Recall that if Q is of Type 1, 2, or 3, then $P^Q = P^{y_Q}$ for some $y_Q \in 5Q_0$. From estimate (3) in Section II.5, we know that

(13) $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(P^{Q}-P^{0}\right)(x_0)\right| \le C(\epsilon)\, M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m-1$.

Since $x_0 \in 5Q_0^+$ (see the hypotheses of the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$) and $P^Q - P^0$ is a polynomial of degree at most $m-1$, and since $\frac{65}{64}Q \subset 5Q \subset 5Q_0$ (because Q is OK), estimate (13) implies the desired estimate (12).

If instead, Q is of Type 4, then by definition $P^Q = P^0$, hence estimate (12) holds trivially.

Thus, (12) holds in all cases. ■

Corollary 4 *For $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $|\beta| \le m$, we have* $\left|\partial^{\beta}\left(F^{Q}-P^{0}\right)\right| \le C(\epsilon)\, M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ *on* $\frac{65}{64}Q$.

Proof. Recall that, since Q is OK, we have $5Q \subset 5Q_0$. The desired estimate therefore follows from estimates (2) and (12). ■

II.8 Completing the Induction

We again place ourselves in the setting of Section II.3. We use the CZ cubes Q and the functions F^Q defined above. We recall several basic results from earlier sections.

(1) $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ is a $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex shape field.

(2) $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$, hence $\epsilon^{-1}\delta_Q \leq \delta_{\max}$ for $Q \in CZ$.

(3) The cubes $Q \in CZ$ partition the interior of $5Q_0$.

(4) For $Q, Q' \in CZ$, if $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$, then $\frac{1}{2}\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q'} \leq 2\delta_Q$.

Let

(5) $\mathcal{Q} = \left\{Q \in CZ : \frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_0 \neq \emptyset\right\}$.

Then

(6) $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite.

For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have

(7) $F^Q \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q\right)$,

(8) $J_z\left(F^Q\right) \in \Gamma_0\left(z, C(\epsilon) M_0\right)$ for $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q$, and

(9) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(F^Q - P^0\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q$, for $|\beta| \leq m$.

(10) For each $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$, if $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$, then $\left|\partial^\beta\left(F^Q - F^{Q'}\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$, for $|\beta| \leq m$.

We introduce a Whitney partition of unity adapted to the cubes $Q \in CZ$. For each $Q \in CZ$, let $\tilde{\theta}_Q \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy

$$\tilde{\theta}_Q = 1 \text{ on } Q, \text{ support } \left(\tilde{\theta}_Q\right) \subset \frac{65}{64}Q, \ \left|\partial^\beta \tilde{\theta}_Q\right| \leq C\delta_Q^{-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m.$$

Setting $\theta_Q = \tilde{\theta}_Q \cdot \left(\sum_{Q' \in CZ}\left(\tilde{\theta}_{Q'}\right)^2\right)^{-1/2}$, we see that

(11) $\theta_Q \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $Q \in CZ$;

(12) support $(\theta_Q) \subset \frac{65}{64}Q$ for $Q \in CZ$.

(13) $\left|\partial^\beta \theta_Q\right| \leq C\delta_Q^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m, Q \in CZ$;

and $\sum_{Q \in CZ} \theta_Q^2 = 1$ on the interior of $5Q_0$, hence

(14) $\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \theta_Q^2 = 1$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q_0$.

We define

(15) $F = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \theta_Q^2 F^Q$.

For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, (7), (11), (12) show that $\theta_Q^2 F^Q \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since also $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite (see (6)), it follows that

(16) $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Moreover, for any $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_0$ and any β of order $|\beta| \leq m$, we have

(17) $\partial^\beta F(x) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}(x)} \partial^\beta \left\{\theta_Q^2 F^Q\right\}$, where

(18) $\mathcal{Q}(x) = \left\{Q \in \mathcal{Q} : x \in \frac{65}{64}Q\right\}$.

Note that

(19) $\#(\mathcal{Q}(x)) \leq C$, by (4).

Let $\hat{Q}$ be the CZ cube containing x. (There is one and only one such cube, thanks to (3); recall that we suppose that $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_0$.) Then $\hat{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}(x)$, and (17) may be written in the form

(20) $\partial^\beta \left(F - P^0\right)(x) = \partial^\beta \left(F^{\hat{Q}} - P^0\right)(x) + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}(x)} \partial^\beta \left\{\theta_Q^2 \cdot \left(F^Q - F^{\hat{Q}}\right)\right\}(x)$.

(Here we use (14).) The first term on the right in (20) has absolute value at most $C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$; see (9). At most C distinct cubes Q enter into the second term on the right in (20); see (19). For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(x)$, we have

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left\{\theta_Q^2 \cdot \left(F^Q - F^{\hat{Q}}\right)\right\}(x)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|},$$

by (10) and (13). Hence, for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(x)$, we have

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left\{\theta_Q^2 \cdot \left(F^Q - F^{\hat{Q}}\right)\right\}(x)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|};$$

see (3).

The above remarks and (19), (20) together yield the estimate

(21) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(F - P^0\right)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64} Q_0$, for $|\beta| \leq m$.

Moreover, let $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64} Q_0$. Then

$$J_z(F) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}(z)} J_z(\theta_Q) \odot_z J_z(\theta_Q) \odot_z J_z\left(F^Q\right) \text{ (see (17))};$$

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left[J_z(\theta_Q)\right](z)\right| \leq C\delta_Q^{-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m-1,\ Q \in \mathcal{Q}(z) \text{ (see (13))};$$

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}(z)} \left[J_z(\theta_Q)\right] \odot_z \left[J_z(\theta_Q)\right] = 1$$

(see (14) and note that $J_z(\theta_Q) = 0$ for $Q \notin \mathcal{Q}(z)$ by (12) and (18));

$$J_z\left(F^Q\right) \in \Gamma_0(z, C(\epsilon) M_0) \text{ for } Q \in \mathcal{Q}(z) \text{ (see (8))};$$

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left\{J_z\left(F^Q\right) - J_z\left(F^{Q'}\right)\right\}(z)\right| \leq C(\epsilon) M_0 \delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$$

for $|\beta| \leq m-1$, $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}(z)$ (see(10));

$$\#\left(\mathcal{Q}(z)\right) \leq C \text{ (see (19))};$$

$$\delta_Q \leq \delta_{\max} \text{ (see (2))};$$

$\vec{\Gamma}_0$ is a $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex shape field (see (1)). The above results, together with Lemma 3, tell us that

(22) $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, C(\epsilon) M_0)$ for all $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64} Q_0$.

From (16), (21), (22), we see at once that the restriction of F to $\frac{65}{64} Q_0$ belongs to $C^m\left(\frac{65}{64} Q_0\right)$ and satisfies conditions (C*1) and (C*2) in Section II.3. As we explained in that section, once we have found a function in $C^m\left(\frac{65}{64} Q_0\right)$ satisfying (C*1) and (C*2), our induction on $\mathcal{A}$ is complete. Thus, we have proven the Main Lemma for all monotonic $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$.

II.9 Restatement of the Main Lemma

In this section, we reformulate the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$ in the case in which $\mathcal{A}$ is the empty set $\emptyset$. Let us examine hypotheses (A1), (A2), (A3) for the Main Lemma for $\mathcal{A}$, taking $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$.

Hypothesis (A1) says that $\vec{\Gamma}_{l(\emptyset)}$ has an $\left(\emptyset, \epsilon^{-1}\delta_{Q_0}, C_B\right)$-basis at $\left(x_0, M_0, P^0\right)$. This means simply that $P^0 \in \Gamma_{l(\emptyset)}(x_0, C_B M_0)$.

Hypothesis (A2) says that $\delta_{Q_0} \leq \epsilon \delta_{\max}$, and hypothesis (A3) says that ϵ is less than a small enough constant determined by C_B, C_w, m, n.

We take ϵ to be a small enough constant (determined by C_B, C_w, m, n) such that (A3) is satisfied. We take $C_B = 1$. Thus, we arrive at the following equivalent version of the Main Lemma for $\emptyset$.

Restated Main Lemma *Let* $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field. For* $l \geq 1$*, let* $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x \in E, M > 0}$ *be the* l^{th}*-refinement of* $\vec{\Gamma}_0$*. Fix a dyadic cube* Q_0 *of sidelength* $\delta_{Q_0} \leq \epsilon \delta_{\max}$*, where* $\epsilon > 0$ *is a small enough constant determined by* m*,* n*,* C_W*. Let* $x_0 \in E \cap 5Q_0^+$*, and let* $P_0 \in \Gamma_{l(\emptyset)}(x_0, M_0)$*.*

Then there exists a function $F \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64} Q_0\right)$*, satisfying*

- $\left|\partial^\beta (F - P_0)(x)\right| \leq C_* M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m - |\beta|}$ *for* $x \in \frac{65}{64} Q_0$*,* $|\beta| \leq m$*; and*
- $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, C_* M_0)$ *for all* $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64} Q_0$*;*

where C_* *is determined by* C_w*,* m*,* n*.*

II.10 Tidying Up

In this section, we remove from the Restated Main Lemma the small constant ϵ and the assumption that Q_0 is dyadic.

Theorem 8 *Let* $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ *be a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field. For* $l \geq 1$*, let* $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ *be the* l^{th}*-refinement of* $\vec{\Gamma}_0$*. Fix a cube* Q_0 *of sidelength* $\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{\max}$*, a point* $x_0 \in E \cap 5Q_0$*, and a real number* $M_0 > 0$*. Let* $P_0 \in \Gamma_{l(\emptyset)+1}(x_0, M_0)$*.*

Then there exists a function $F \in C^m(Q_0)$ *satisfying the following, with* C_* *determined by* C_w*,* m*,* n*.*

- $\left|\partial^\beta (F - P_0)(x)\right| \leq C_* M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $x \in Q_0$*,* $|\beta| \leq m$*; and*
- $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, C_* M_0)$ *for all* $z \in E \cap Q_0$*.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be the small constant in the statement of the Restated Main Lemma in Section II.9. In particular, ϵ is determined by C_w, m, n. We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by C_w, m, n. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences.

We cover CQ_0 by a grid of dyadic cubes $\{Q_\nu\}$, all having same sidelength δ_{Q_ν}, with $\frac{\epsilon}{20}\delta_{Q_0} \leq \delta_{Q_\nu} \leq \epsilon\delta_{Q_0}$, and all contained in $C'Q_0$. (We use at most C distinct Q_ν to do so.)

For each Q_ν with $E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu \neq \emptyset$, we pick a point $x_\nu \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$; by definition of the l^{th}-refinement, there exists $P_\nu \in \Gamma_{l(\emptyset)}(x_\nu, M_0)$ such that $\left|\partial^\beta (P_\nu - P_0)(x_0)\right| \leq CM_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$, and therefore

(1) $\left|\partial^\beta (P_\nu - P_0)(x)\right| \leq C'M_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_0$ and $|\beta| \leq m$.

Since $x_\nu \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$, $P_\nu \in \Gamma_{l(\emptyset)}$, and $\delta_{Q_\nu} \leq \epsilon\delta_{Q_0} \leq \epsilon\delta_{\max}$, the Restated Main Lemma applies to x_ν, P_ν, Q_ν to produce $F_\nu \in C^m\left(\frac{65}{64}Q_\nu\right)$ satisfying

(2) $\left|\partial^\beta (F_\nu - P_\nu)(x)\right| \leq CM_0\delta_{Q_\nu}^{m-|\beta|} \leq CM_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$, $|\beta| \leq m$;

and

(3) $J_z(F_\nu) \in \Gamma_0(z, CM_0)$ for all $z \in E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$.

From (1) and (2), we have

(4) $\left|\partial^\beta (F_\nu - P_0)(x)\right| \leq CM_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$, $|\beta| \leq m$.

We have produced such F_ν for those ν satisfying $E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu \neq \emptyset$. If instead $E \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu = \emptyset$, then we set $F_\nu = P_0$. Then (3) holds vacuously and (4) holds trivially. Thus, our F_ν satisfy (3), (4) for all ν. From (4) we obtain

(5) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(F_\nu - F_{\nu'}\right)(x)\right| \le CM_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu \cap \frac{65}{64}Q_{\nu'}$, $|\beta| \le m$.

Next, we introduce a partition of unity. We fix cutoff functions $\theta_\nu \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)$ satisfying

(6) support $\theta_\nu \subset \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$, $\left|\partial^\beta\theta_\nu\right| \le C\delta_{Q_0}^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m$, $\sum_\nu \theta_\nu^2 = 1$ on Q_0.

We then define

(7) $F = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu^2 F_\nu$ on Q_0.

We have then

(8) $F - P_0 = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu^2\left(F_\nu - P_0\right)$ on Q_0.

Thanks to (4) and (6), we have $\theta_\nu^2\left(F_\nu - P_0\right) \in C^m\left(Q_0\right)$ and $\left|\partial^\beta\left(\theta_\nu^2 \cdot \left(F_\nu - P_0\right)\right)(x)\right| \le CM_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x \in Q_0, |\beta| \le m$, all ν. Moreover, there are at most C distinct ν appearing in (8). Hence,

(9) $F \in C^m\left(Q_0\right)$

and

(10) $\left|\partial^\beta\left(F - P_0\right)(x)\right| \le CM_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x \in Q_0$, $|\beta| \le m$.

Next, let $z \in E \cap Q_0$, and let Y be the set of all ν such that $z \in \frac{65}{64}Q_\nu$. Then (6), (7) give $J_z(F) = \sum_{\nu\in Y} J_z\left(\theta_\nu\right) \odot_z J_z\left(\theta_\nu\right) \odot_z J_z\left(F_\nu\right)$ and we know that $J_z(F_\nu) \in \Gamma_0\left(z, CM_0\right)$ for $\nu \in Y$ (by (3)); $\left|\partial^\beta\left[J_z\left(F_\nu\right) - J_z\left(F_{\nu'}\right)\right](z)\right| \le CM_0\delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m-1$, $\nu, \nu' \in Y$ (by (5)); $\left|\partial^\beta\left[J_z\left(\theta_\nu\right)\right](z)\right| \le C\delta_{Q_0}^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \le m-1$, $\nu \in Y$ (by (6)); $\sum_{\nu\in Y} J_z\left(\theta_\nu\right) \odot_z J_z\left(\theta_\nu\right) = 1$ (again thanks to (6)); $\#(Y) \le C$ (since there are at most C distinct Q_ν in our grid); and $\delta_{Q_0} \le \delta_{\max}$ (by hypothesis of the Theorem we are proving). Since $\vec{\Gamma}_0$ is $(C, \delta_{\max})$-convex, the above remarks and Lemma 3 tell us that $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, CM_0)$. Thus,

(11) $J_z\left(F\right) \in \Gamma_0\left(z, CM_0\right)$ for all $z \in E \cap Q_0$.

Our results (9), (10), (11) are the conclusions of Theorem 8.
The proof of that Theorem is complete. ■

Part III
Applications

III.1 Finiteness Principle I

In this section we prove a finiteness principle for shape fields.

Let $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ be a shape field. For $l \geq 1$, let $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ be the l^{th}-refinement of $\vec{\Gamma}_0$. Fix $M_0 > 0$. For $x \in E$, $S \subset E$, define

$$(1)\quad \Gamma(x, S) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} P^x : \vec{P} = (P^y)_{y\in S\cup\{x\}} \in \mathcal{W}h(S\cup\{x\}),\ \left\|\vec{P}\right\|_{\dot{C}^m(S\cup\{x\})} \leq M_0, \\ P^y \in \Gamma_0(y, M_0) \text{ for all } y \in S\cup\{x\}. \end{array} \right\}$$

(See Section I.1 for the definition of $\mathcal{W}h(\cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{C}^m(\cdot)}$.) Note that

$$(2)\quad \Gamma(x, \emptyset) = \Gamma_0(x, M_0).$$

Define

$$(3)\quad \Gamma_l^{fp}(x, M_0) = \bigcap_{S\subset E, \#(S)\leq (D+2)^l} \Gamma(x, S) \text{ for } l \geq 0, \text{ where}$$

$$(4)\quad D = \dim \mathcal{P}.$$

Note that

$$(5)\quad \Gamma_0^{fp}(x, M_0) \subseteq \Gamma_0(x, M_0), \text{ thanks to (2).}$$

Each $\Gamma(x, S)$, $\Gamma_l^{fp}(x, M_0)$ is a (possibly empty) convex subset of $\mathcal{P}$.

Lemma 20 *Let $x \in E$, $l \geq 0$. Suppose $\Gamma(x, S) \neq \emptyset$ for all $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq (D+2)^{l+1}$. Then $\Gamma_l^{fp}(x, M_0) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. By Helly's theorem, it is enough to show that $\Gamma(x, S_1) \cap \cdots \cap \Gamma(x, S_{D+1}) \neq \emptyset$ for any $S_1, \cdots, S_{D+1} \subset E$ with $\#(S_i) \leq (D+2)^l$ for each i. However, $\Gamma(x, S_1) \cap \cdots \cap \Gamma(x, S_{D+1}) \supset \Gamma(x, S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1}) \neq \emptyset$, since $\#(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1}) \leq (D+1)\cdot(D+2)^l \leq (D+2)^{l+1}$. ■

Lemma 21 *For $x \in E, l \geq 0$, we have*

(6) $\Gamma_l^{fp}(x, M_0) \subseteq \Gamma_l(x, M_0)$.

Proof. We use induction on l. The base case $l = 0$ is our observation (5). For the induction step, fix $l \geq 1$. We will prove (6) under the inductive assumption

(7) $\Gamma_{l-1}^{fp}(y, M_0) \subseteq \Gamma_{l-1}(y, M_0)$ for all $y \in E$.

Thus, let $P \in \Gamma_l^{fp}(x, M_0)$ be given. We must prove that $P \in \Gamma_l(x, M_0)$, which means that given $y \in E$ there exists

(8) $P' \in \Gamma_{l-1}(y, M_0)$ such that $\left|\partial^\beta (P - P')(x)\right| \leq M_0 |x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

We will prove that there exists

(9) $P' \in \Gamma_{l-1}^{fp}(y, M_0)$ such that $\left|\partial^\beta (P - P')(x)\right| \leq M_0 |x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

Thanks to our inductive hypothesis (7), we see that (9) implies (8). Therefore, to complete the proof of the Lemma, it is enough to prove the existence of a P' satisfying (9). For $S \subset E$, define

$$\hat{\Gamma}(S) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} P^y : \vec{P} = (P^z)_{z \in S \cup \{x,y\}} \in \mathcal{W}h(S \cup \{x, y\}),\ P^x = P,\ \left\|\vec{P}\right\|_{\dot{C}^m(S \cup \{x,y\})} \leq M_0, \\ P^z \in \Gamma_0(z, M_0) \text{ for all } z \in S \cup \{x, y\}. \end{array} \right\}$$

By definition,

(10) $\hat{\Gamma}(S) \subset \Gamma(y, S)$ for $S \subset E$.

Let $S_1, \cdots, S_{D+1} \subset E$ with $\#(S_i) \leq (D+2)^{l-1}$ for each i.

Then $\hat{\Gamma}(S_1) \cap \cdots \cap \hat{\Gamma}(S_{D+1}) \supset \hat{\Gamma}(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1})$, and $\#(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1} \cup \{y\}) \leq (D+1)(D+2)^{l-1} + 1 \leq (D+2)^l$. Since $P \in \Gamma_l^{fp}(x, M_0)$, it follows that there exists $\vec{P} = (P^z)_{z \in S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1} \cup \{x,y\}} \in \mathcal{W}h(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1} \cup \{x, y\})$ such that $P^x = P$, $\left\|\vec{P}\right\|_{\dot{C}^m(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1} \cup \{x,y\})} \leq M_0$, $P^z \in \Gamma_0(z, M_0)$ for all $z \in S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1} \cup \{x, y\}$. We then have $P^y \in \hat{\Gamma}(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1})$, hence $\hat{\Gamma}(S_1) \cap \cdots \hat{\Gamma}(S_{D+1}) \supset \hat{\Gamma}(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_{D+1}) \neq \emptyset$.

By Helly's theorem, there exists

(11) $P' \in \bigcap_{S \subset E, \#(S) \le (D+2)^{l-1}} \hat{\Gamma}(S)$.

In particular, $P' \in \hat{\Gamma}(\emptyset)$, which implies that

$$\left|\partial^\beta (P - P')(x)\right| \le M_0 |x-y|^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1.$$

Also, (10), (11) imply that

$$P' \in \bigcap_{S \subset E, \#(S) \le (D+2)^{l-1}} \Gamma(y,S) = \Gamma^{fp}_{l-1}(y, M_0).$$

Thus, P' satisfies (9), completing the proof of Lemma 21. ■

Theorem 9 (Finiteness Principle for Shape Fields) *For a large enough* $k^\#$ *determined by* m, n, *the following holds. Let* $\vec{\Gamma}_0 = (\Gamma_0(x, M))_{x \in E, M>0}$ *be a* $(C_w, \delta_{\max})$*-convex shape field and let* $Q_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *be a cube of sidelength* $\delta_{Q_0} \le \delta_{\max}$. *Also, let* $x_0 \in E \cap 5Q_0$ *and* $M_0 > 0$ *be given. Assume that for each* $S \subset E$ *with* $\#(S) \le k^\#$ *there exists a Whitney field* $\vec{P}^S = (P^z)_{z \in S}$ *such that*

$$\left\|\vec{P}^S\right\|_{\dot{C}^m(S)} \le M_0,$$

and

$$P^z \in \Gamma_0(z, M_0) \text{ for all } z \in S.$$

Then there exist $P^0 \in \Gamma_0(x_0, M_0)$ *and* $F \in C^m(Q_0)$ *such that the following hold, with a constant* C_* *determined by* C_w, m, n*:*

- $J_z(F) \in \Gamma_0(z, C_* M_0)$ *for all* $z \in E \cap Q_0$.
- $|\partial^\beta (F - P^0)(x)| \le C_* M_0 \delta_{Q_0}^{m-|\beta|}$ *for all* $x \in Q_0$, $|\beta| \le m$.
- *In particular,* $\left|\partial^\beta F(x)\right| \le C_* M_0$ *for all* $x \in Q_0$, $|\beta| = m$.

Proof. For $l \ge 1$, define $\vec{\Gamma}_l = (\Gamma_l(x, M))_{x \in E, M>0}$ and $\vec{\Gamma}^{fp}_l = \left(\Gamma^{fp}_l(x, M)\right)_{x \in E, M>0}$ as in Lemmas 20 and 21. We take $l_* = 100 + l(\emptyset)$ and $k^\# = 100 + (D+2)^{l_*+100}$. (For the definition of $l(\emptyset)$, see Section II.1.)

Lemmas 20 and 21 show that $\Gamma^{fp}_{l_*}(x_0, M_0)$ is nonempty, hence $\Gamma_{l(\emptyset)+1}(x_0, M_0)$ is nonempty. Pick any $P^0 \in \Gamma_{l(\emptyset)+1}(x_0, M_0) \subset \Gamma_0(x_0, M_0)$. Then Theorem 8 in Section II.10 produces a function $F \in C^m(Q_0)$ with the desired properties. ■

III.2 Finiteness Principle II

In this section, we prove the following result.

Theorem 10 (Finiteness Principle for Vector-Valued Functions) *Fix* m, n, $D \geq 1$. *Then there exist* $k^{\#}$, C *(determined by* m, n, D*), such that the following holds.*

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *be finite. For each* $x \in E$, *let* $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ *be convex. Assume that for any* $S \subseteq E$ *with* $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$, *there exists* $F^S \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)$ *such that*

(1) $\|F^S\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq 1$ *and* $F^S(z) \in K(z)$ *for all* $z \in S$.

Then there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)$ *such that*

(2) $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C$ *and* $F(z) \in K(z)$ *for all* $z \in E$.

Proof. Let us first set up notation. We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by m, n, D; these symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences. We will work with C^m vector and scalar-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and also with C^{m+1} scalar-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^{n+D}$. We use Roman letters $(x, y, z, \cdots)$ to denote points of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and Greek letters $(\xi, \eta, \zeta, \cdots)$ to denote points of $\mathbb{R}^D$. We denote points of the $\mathbb{R}^{n+D}$ by (x, ξ), (y, η), etc. As usual, $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the vector space of real-valued polynomials of degree at most $m-1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We write $\mathcal{P}^D$ to denote the direct sum of D copies of $\mathcal{P}$. If $F \in C^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)$ with $F(x) = (F_1(x), \cdots, F_D(x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $J_x(F) := (J_x(F_1), \cdots, J_x(F_D)) \in \mathcal{P}^D$.

We write $\mathcal{P}^+$ to denote the vector space of real-valued polynomials of degree at most m on $\mathbb{R}^{n+D}$. If $F \in C^{m+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n+D}\right)$, then we write $J^+_{(x,\xi)}F \in \mathcal{P}^+$ to denote the m^{th}-degree Taylor polynomial of F at the point $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+D}$.

When we work with $\mathcal{P}^+$, we write $\odot_{(x,\xi)}$ to denote the multiplication

$$P \odot_{(x,\xi)} Q := J^+_{(x,\xi)}(PQ) \in \mathcal{P}^+ \text{ for } P, Q \in \mathcal{P}^+.$$

We will use Theorem 9 for C^{m+1}-functions on $\mathbb{R}^{n+D}$. Thus, $m+1$ and $n+D$ will play the rôles of m, n, respectively, when we apply that theorem.

We take $k^{\#}$ as in Theorem 9, where we use $m+1, n+D$ in place of m, n, respectively.

We now introduce the relevant shape field.

Let $E^+ = \left\{(x, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+D} : x \in E\right\}$. For $(x_0, 0) \in E^+$ and $M > 0$, let

(3) $\Gamma((x_0,0),M) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} P \in \mathcal{P}^+ : P(x_0,0) = 0, \nabla_\xi P(x_0,0) \in K(x_0), \\ \left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta P(x_0,0)\right| \leq M \text{ for } |\alpha|+|\beta| \leq m \end{array} \right\} \subset \mathcal{P}^+.$

Let $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x_0,0),M)_{(x_0,0)\in E^+, M>0}$.

Lemma 22 *$\vec{\Gamma}$ is a $(C,1)$-convex shape field.*

Proof of Lemma 22. Clearly, each $\Gamma((x_0,0),M)$ is a (possibly empty) convex subset of $\mathcal{P}^+$, and $M' \leq M$ implies $\Gamma((x_0,0),M') \subseteq \Gamma((x_0,0),M)$. Thus, $\vec{\Gamma}$ is a shape field (with $m+1$, $n+D$ playing the rôles of m, n, respectively). To prove $(C,1)$-convexity, let $x_0 \in E, 0 < \delta \leq 1$, let

(4) $P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma((x_0,0),M)$ with

(5) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (P_1 - P_2)(x_0,0)\right| \leq M\delta^{(m+1)-|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq m$; and let

(6) $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}^+$, with

(7) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta Q_i(x_0,0)\right| \leq \delta^{-|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for $i = 1,2$, $|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq m$, and with

(8) $Q_1 \odot_{(x_0,0)} Q_1 + Q_2 \odot_{(x_0,0)} Q_2 = 1$.

We must show that the polynomial

(9) $P := Q_1 \odot_{(x_0,0)} Q_1 \odot_{(x_0,0)} P_1 + Q_2 \odot_{(x_0,0)} Q_2 \odot_{(x_0,0)} P_2$

belongs to $\Gamma((x_0,0),CM)$.

From (3), (4), we have

(10) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta P_1(x_0,0)\right| \leq M$ for $|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq m$,

(11) $P_1(x_0,0) = P_2(x_0,0) = 0$, and

(12) $\nabla_\xi P_1(x_0,0)$, $\nabla_\xi P_2(x_0,0) \in K(x_0)$.

Then (9), (11) give

$$P(x_0, 0) = 0$$

and

$$\nabla_\xi P(x_0, 0) = (Q_1(x_0, 0))^2 \nabla_\xi P_1(x_0, 0) + (Q_2(x_0, 0))^2 \nabla_\xi P_2(x_0, 0)$$

while (8) yields

$$(Q_1(x_0, 0))^2 + (Q_2(x_0, 0))^2 = 1.$$

Together with (12) and convexity of $K(x_0)$, the above remarks imply that

(13) $P(x_0, 0) = 0$ and $\nabla_\xi P(x_0, 0) \in K(x_0)$.

Also, (8), (9) imply the formula

(14) $P = P_1 + Q_2 \odot_{(x_0,0)} Q_2 \odot_{(x_0,0)} (P_2 - P_1)$.

From (5), (7), and $\delta \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \left[Q_2 \odot_{(x_0,0)} Q_2 \odot_{(x_0,0)} (P_2 - P_1)\right](x_0, 0)\right| &\leq CM\delta^{(m+1)-|\alpha|-|\beta|} \\ &\leq CM \end{aligned}$$

for $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$. Together with (10) and (14), this tells us that

(15) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta P(x_0, 0)\right| \leq CM$ for $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$.

From (13), (15) and the definition (3), we see that $P \in \Gamma((x_0, 0), CM)$, completing the proof of Lemma 22. ■

Lemma 23 *Let $S^+ \subset E^+$ with $\#(S^+) \leq k^\#$. Then there exists $\vec{P} = (P^z)_{z \in S^+}$, with each $P^z \in \mathcal{P}^+$, such that*

(16) $P^z \in \Gamma(z, C)$ for each $z \in S^+$, and

(17) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \left(P^z - P^{z'}\right)(z)\right| \leq C|z - z'|^{(m+1)-|\alpha|-|\beta|}$ for z, $z' \in S^+$ and $|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq m$.

Proof of Lemma 23. Since $E^+ = E \times \{0\}$, we have $S^+ = S \times \{0\}$ for an $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$. By hypothesis of Theorem 10, there exists $F^S \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ such that

(18) $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq 1$ and $F^S(x_0) \in K(x_0)$ for all $x_0 \in S$.

Let $F^S(x) = \left(F_1^S(x), \cdots, F_D^S(x)\right)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\vec{P} = \left(P^{(x_0,0)}\right)_{(x_0,0)\in S\times\{0\}}$ with

(19) $P^{(x_0,0)}(x,\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} \xi_i \left[J_{x_0}\left(F_i^S\right)(x)\right]$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_D) \in \mathbb{R}^D$.

Each $P^{(x_0,0)}$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}^+$ and satisfies

(20) $P^{(x_0,0)}(x_0,0) = 0$, $\nabla_\xi P^{(x_0,0)}(x_0,0) \in K(x_0)$, and

and

(21) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta P^{(x_0,0)}(x_0,0)\right| \leq C$ for $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$,

thanks to (18), (19). Our results (20), (21) and definition (3) together imply (16). We pass to (17). Let $(x_0,0), (y_0,0) \in S^+ = S \times \{0\}$. From (18), (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_{\xi_j}\left(P^{(x_0,0)} - P^{(y_0,0)}\right)(x_0,0)\right| &= \left|\partial_x^\alpha\left(J_{x_0}\left(F_j^S\right) - J_{y_0}\left(F_j^S\right)\right)(x_0)\right| \\ &\leq C|x_0 - y_0|^{m-|\alpha|} \\ &= C|x_0 - y_0|^{(m+1)-(|\alpha|+1)}\end{aligned}$$

for $|\alpha| \leq m-1$, $j = 1, \cdots, D$. For $|\beta| \neq 1$, we have

$$\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta\left(P^{(x_0,0)} - P^{(y_0,0)}\right)(x_0,0) = 0$$

by (19). The above remarks imply (17), completing the proof of Lemma 23. ■

Lemma 24 *Given a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of sidelength $\delta_Q = 1$, there exists $F^Q \in C^m(Q, \mathbb{R}^D)$ such that*

(22) $\left|\partial^\alpha F^Q(x)\right| \leq C$ *for* $x \in Q$, $|\alpha| \leq m$*; and*

(23) $F^Q(z) \in K(z)$ *for all* $z \in E \cap Q$.

Proof of Lemma 24. If $E \cap Q = \emptyset$, then we can just take $F^Q \equiv 0$. Otherwise, pick $x_{00} \in E \cap Q$, let $Q' \in \mathbb{R}^D$ be a cube of sidelength $\delta_{Q'} = 1$, containing the origin in its interior, and apply Theorem 9 (with $m+1$, $n+D$ in place of m, n, respectively) to the shape field $\vec{\Gamma} = (\Gamma(x_0, 0), M)_{(x_0,0)\in E^+, M>0}$ given by (3), the cube $Q_0 := Q \times Q' \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+D}$, the point $(x_{00}, 0)$, and the number $M_0 = C$.

Lemmas 22 and 23 tell us that the above data satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 9. Applying Theorem 9, we obtain

(24) $P_0 \in \Gamma((x_{00}, 0), C)$ and $F \in C^{m+1}(Q \times Q')$ such that

(25) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (F - P_0)(x, \xi)\right| \leq C$ for $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m + 1$ and $(x, \xi) \in Q \times Q'$; and

(26) $J^+_{(z,0)}(F) \in \Gamma((z, 0), C)$ for all $z \in E \cap Q$.

By (24), (26) and definition (3), we have

(27) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta P_0(x_{00}, 0)\right| \leq C$ for $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$

and

(28) $\nabla_\xi F(z, 0) \in K(z)$ for all $z \in E \cap Q$.

Since $(x_{00}, 0) \in Q \times Q'$ and $\delta_{Q\times Q'} = 1$, (27) implies that

$$\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta P_0(x, \xi)\right| \leq C$$

for $(x, \xi) \in Q \times Q'$, $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m + 1$. (Recall that P_0 is a polynomial of degree at most m.) Together with (25), this implies that

(29) $\left|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta F(x, \xi)\right| \leq C$ for $(x, \xi) \in Q \times Q'$, $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m + 1$.

Taking

$$F^Q(x) = \nabla_\xi F(x, 0) \text{ for } x \in Q,$$

we learn from (28), (29) that $F^Q \in C^m\left(Q, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$; $\left|\partial^\alpha F^Q(x)\right| \leq C$ for $x \in Q$, $|\alpha| \leq m$; and $F^Q(z) \in K(z)$ for all $z \in E \cap Q$. Thus, F^Q satisfies (22) and (23), completing the proof of Lemma 24. ■

Now, we can easily finish the proof of Theorem 10. We introduce a partition of unity

$$1 = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where for each ν: $\theta_\nu \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$; $\theta_\nu \geq 0$, $|\partial^\alpha \theta_\nu| \leq C$ for $|\alpha| \leq m$, support $\theta_\nu \subset Q_\nu$ for a cube Q_ν of sidelength $\delta_{Q_\nu} = 1$; and any given point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has a neighborhood that intersects Q_ν for at most C distinct ν. For each Q_ν, we apply Lemma 24 to produce a function $F_\nu \in C^m\left(Q_\nu, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ such that $|\partial^\alpha F_\nu(x)| \leq C$ for $x \in Q_\nu$, $|\alpha| \leq m$; and $F_\nu(z) \in K(z)$ for all $z \in E \cap Q_\nu$.

We then define

(30) $F = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu F_\nu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In a small enough neighborhood of any given point of $\mathbb{R}^n$, this sum contains at most C nonzero terms, and for each ν, we have

$$|\partial^\alpha (\theta_\nu F_\nu)(x)| \leq C \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ |\alpha| \leq m.$$

Therefore, $F \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$, and $|\partial^\alpha F(x)| \leq C$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\alpha| \leq m$; i.e.,

(31) $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C$.

Moreover, let $z \in E$. Then $\theta_\nu(z)$ is nonzero for at most C distinct ν, each $\theta_\nu(z)$ is nonnegative; and $\sum_\nu \theta_\nu(z) = 1$. Since $z \in E$, we have $F_\nu(z) \in K(z)$ whenever $z \in$ support θ_ν. Therefore, (30) exhibits $F(z)$ as a convex combination of vectors in $K(z) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$. Since $K(z)$ is convex, we have

(32) $F(z) \in K(z)$ for all $z \in E$.

Thanks to (31), (32), our $F \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ satisfies (2).

This completes the proof of Theorem 10. ■

III.3 Interpolation by Nonnegative Functions

In this section, c, C, C', etc. denote constants determined by m and n. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M > 0$, define

$$(1)\ \Gamma_*(x,M) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} P \in \mathcal{P}:\ \text{There exists } F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ with } \|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le M, \\ F \ge 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n,\ J_x(F) = P. \end{array} \right\}$$

It is not immediately clear how to compute Γ_*; we will return to this issue in a later section. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be finite, and let $f : E \to [0,\infty)$. Define $\vec{\Gamma}_f = (\Gamma_f(x,M))_{x\in E, M>0}$, where

$$(2)\ \Gamma_f(x,M) = \{P \in \Gamma_*(x,M) : P(x) = f(x)\}.$$

Lemma 25 *$\vec{\Gamma}_f$ is a $(C,1)$-convex shape field.*

Proof. It is clear that $\vec{\Gamma}_f$ is a shape field, i.e., each $\Gamma_f(x,M)$ is convex, and $M' \le M$ implies $\Gamma_f(x,M') \subseteq \Gamma_f(x,M)$. To establish $(C,1)$-convexity, suppose we are given the following:

$$(3)\ 0 < \delta \le 1,\ x \in E,\ M > 0;$$

$$(4)\ P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma_f(x,M) \text{ satisfying}$$

$$(5)\ \left|\partial^\beta (P_1 - P_2)(x)\right| \le M\delta^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1;$$

$$(6)\ Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{P} \text{ satisfying}$$

$$(7)\ \left|\partial^\beta Q_i(x)\right| \le \delta^{-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \le m-1,\ i = 1,2, \text{ and}$$

$$(8)\ Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 = 1.$$

Set

$$(9)\ P = Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 \odot_x P_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 \odot_x P_2.$$

We must prove that

$$(10)\ P \in \Gamma_f(x, CM).$$

Thanks to (4), we have

(11) $P_1(x) = f(x)$ and $P_2(x) = f(x)$,

and there exist functions $F_1, F_2 \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

(12) $\|F_i\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M$ $(i = 1, 2)$,

(13) $F_i \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ $(i = 1, 2)$, and

(14) $J_x(F_i) = P_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

We fix F_1, F_2 as above. By (8), we have $|Q_i(x)| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ for $i = 1$ or for $i = 2$. By possibly interchanging Q_1 and Q_2, and then possibly changing Q_1 to $-Q_1$, we may suppose that

(15) $Q_1(x) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

For small enough c_0, (7) and (15) yield

(16) $Q_1(y) \geq \frac{1}{10}$ for $|y - x| \leq c_0\delta$.

Fix c_0 as in (16). We introduce a C^m cutoff function χ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the following properties.

(17) $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$; $\chi = 0$ outside $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$; $\chi = 1$ in a neighborhood of x;

(18) $\left|\partial^\beta \chi\right| \leq C\delta^{-|\beta|}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, for $|\beta| \leq m$.

We then define $\tilde{\theta}_1 = \chi \cdot Q_1 + (1 - \chi)$ and $\tilde{\theta}_2 = \chi \cdot Q_2$.

These functions satisfy the following: $\tilde{\theta}_i \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\left|\partial^\beta \tilde{\theta}_i\right| \leq C\delta^{-|\beta|}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $|\beta| \leq m$, $i = 1, 2$; $\tilde{\theta}_1 \geq \frac{1}{10}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$; $J_x\left(\tilde{\theta}_i\right) = Q_i$ for $i = 1, 2$; outside $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ we have $\tilde{\theta}_1 = 1$ and $\tilde{\theta}_2 = 0$. Setting $\theta_i = \tilde{\theta}_i \cdot \left(\tilde{\theta}_1^2 + \tilde{\theta}_2^2\right)^{-1/2}$ for $i = 1, 2$, we find that

(19) $\theta_i \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\left|\partial^\beta \theta_i\right| \leq C\delta^{-|\beta|}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $|\beta| \leq m$, $i = 1, 2$;

(20) $\theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 = 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$;

(21) $J_x(\theta_i) = Q_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ (here we use (8)); and

(22) outside $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ we have $\theta_1 = 1$ and $\theta_2 = 0$.

Now set

(23) $F = \theta_1^2 F_1 + \theta_2^2 F_2 = F_1 + \theta_2^2 (F_2 - F_1)$ (see (20)).

Clearly $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By (14), we have $J_x(F_2 - F_1) = P_2 - P_1$; hence (5) yields the estimate

$$\left|\partial^\beta (F_2 - F_1)(x)\right| \leq CM\delta^{m-|\beta|} \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m - 1.$$

Together with (12), this tells us that

$$\left|\partial^\beta (F_2 - F_1)\right| \leq CM\delta^{m-|\beta|} \text{ on } B_n(x, c_0\delta) \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m.$$

Recalling (19), we deduce that

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left(\theta_2^2 \cdot (F_2 - F_1)\right)\right| \leq CM\delta^{m-|\beta|} \text{ on } B_n(x, c_0\delta) \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m.$$

Together with (12) and (23), this implies that

$$\left|\partial^\beta F\right| \leq CM \text{ on } B_n(x, c_0\delta),$$

since $0 < \delta \leq 1$ (see (3)). On the other hand, outside $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ we have $F = F_1$ by (22), (23); hence $|\partial^\beta F| \leq CM$ outside $B_n(x, c_0\delta)$ for $|\beta| \leq m$, by (12). Thus, $|\partial^\beta F| \leq CM$ on all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $|\beta| \leq m$, i.e.,

(24) $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM$.

Also, from (13) and (23) we have

(25) $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$;

and (9), (14), (21), (23) imply that

(26) $J_x(F) = Q_1 \odot_x Q_1 \odot_x P_1 + Q_2 \odot_x Q_2 \odot_x P_2 = P$.

Since $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies (24), (25), (26), we have

(27) $P \in \Gamma_*(x, CM)$.

Moreover,

(28) $P(x) = (Q_1(x))^2 f(x) + (Q_2(x))^2 f(x) = f(x)$,

thanks to (8), (9), (11). From (27), (28) we conclude that $P \in \Gamma_f(x, CM)$, completing the proof of Lemma 25. ■

Lemma 26 *Let $(P^x)_{x \in E}$ be a Whitney field on the finite set E, and let $M > 0$. Suppose that*

(29) $P^x \in \Gamma_*(x, M)$ for each $x \in E$,

and that

(30) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^x - P^{x'}\right)(x)\right| \leq M|x - x'|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x, x' \in E$ and $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

Then there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

(31) $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM$,

(32) $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and

(33) $J_x(F) = P^x$ for all $x \in E$.

Proof. We modify slightly Whitney's proof [32] of the Whitney extension theorem. We say that a dyadic cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is "OK" if $\#(E \cap 5Q) \leq 1$ and $\delta_Q \leq 1$. Then every small enough Q is OK (because E is finite), and no Q of sidelength $\delta_Q > 1$ is OK. Also, let Q, Q' be dyadic cubes with $5Q \subset 5Q'$. If Q' is OK, then also Q is OK. We define a Calderón-Zygmund (or CZ) cube to be an OK cube Q such that no Q' that strictly contains Q is OK. The above remarks imply that the CZ cubes form a partition of $\mathbb{R}^n$; that the sidelengths of the CZ cubes are bounded above by 1 and below by some positive number; and that the following condition holds.

(34) "Good Geometry": If $Q, Q' \in CZ$ and $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$, then $\frac{1}{2}\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q'} \leq 2\delta_Q$.

We classify CZ cubes into three types as follows.
$Q \in CZ$ is of

Type 1 if $E \cap 5Q \neq \emptyset$

Type 2 if $E \cap 5Q = \emptyset$ and $\delta_Q < 1$.

Type 3 if $E \cap 5Q = \emptyset$ and $\delta_Q = 1$.

Let $Q \in CZ$ be of Type 1. Since Q is OK, we have $\#(E \cap 5Q) \leq 1$. Hence $E \cap 5Q$ is a singleton, $E \cap 5Q = \{x_Q\}$. Since $P^{x_Q} \in \Gamma_* (x_Q, M)$, there exists $F_Q \in C^m (\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

(35) $\|F_Q\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M$, $F_Q \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $J_{x_Q} (F_Q) = P^{x_Q}$.

We fix F_Q as in (35).
Let $Q \in CZ$ be of Type 2. Then $\delta_{Q^+} \leq 1$ but Q^+ is not OK; hence $\# (E \cap 5Q^+) \geq 2$. We pick $x_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+$. Since $P^{x_Q} \in \Gamma_* (x_Q, M)$, there exists $F_Q \in C^m (\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying (35). We fix such an F_Q.
Let $Q \in CZ$ be of Type 3. Then we set $F_Q = 0$. In place of (35), we have the trivial results

(36) $\|F_Q\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0$ and $F_Q \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Thus, we have defined F_Q for all $Q \in CZ$, and we have defined $x_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+$ for all Q of Type 1 or Type 2. Note that

(37) $J_x (F_Q) = P^x$ for all $x \in E \cap 5Q$.

Indeed, if Q is of Type 1, then (37) follows from (35) since $E \cap 5Q = \{x_Q\}$. If Q is of Type 2 or Type 3, then (37) holds vacuously since $E \cap 5Q = \emptyset$. Now suppose $Q, Q' \in CZ$ and $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$. We will show that

(38) $\left|\partial^\beta (F_Q - F_{Q'})\right| \leq CM\delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$ for $|\beta| \leq m$.

To see this, suppose first that Q or Q' is of Type 3. Then δ_Q or $\delta_{Q'}$ is equal to 1, hence $\delta_Q \geq \frac{1}{2}$ by (34). Consequently, (38) asserts simply that

(39) $\left|\partial^\beta (F_Q - F_{Q'})\right| \leq CM$ on $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$ for $|\beta| \leq m$,

and (39) follows at once from (35), (36). Thus, (38) holds if Q or Q' is of Type 3. Suppose that neither Q nor Q' is of Type 3. Then $x_Q \in E \cap 5Q^+$, $x_{Q'} \in E \cap 5(Q'^+)$, $\frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q' \neq \emptyset$, $\frac{1}{2}\delta_Q \leq \delta_{Q'} \leq 2\delta_Q$. Consequently,

(40) $|x_Q - x_{Q'}| \leq C\delta_Q$, and

(41) $|x - x_Q|, |x - x_{Q'}| \leq C\delta_Q$ for all $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$.

Applying (35) to Q and to Q', we find that

(42) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(F_Q - P^{x_Q}\right)(x)\right| \leq CM\,|x - x_Q|^{m-|\beta|} \leq CM\delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$, and

(43) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(F_{Q'} - P^{x_{Q'}}\right)(x)\right| \leq CM\,|x - x_{Q'}|^{m-|\beta|} \leq CM\delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$,

for $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$, $|\beta| \leq m$.
Also, (30), (40), (41) imply that

(44) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^{x_Q} - P^{x_{Q'}}\right)(x)\right| \leq CM\delta_Q^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q \cap \frac{65}{64}Q'$, $|\beta| \leq m$.

(Recall, $P^{x_Q} - P^{x_{Q'}}$ is a polynomial of degree at most $m-1$.)

Estimates (42), (43), (44) together imply (38) in case neither Q nor Q' is of Type 3. Thus, (38) holds in all cases.

Next, as in Whitney [32], we introduce a partition of unity

(45) $1 = \sum_{Q \in CZ} \theta_Q$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$,

where each $\theta_Q \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and

(46) support $\theta_Q \subset \frac{65}{64}Q$, $\left|\partial^\beta \theta_Q\right| \leq C\delta_Q^{-|\beta|}$ for $|\beta| \leq m$, $\theta_Q \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

We define

(47) $F = \sum_{Q \in CZ} \theta_Q F_Q$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Thus, $F \in C^m_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ since CZ is a locally finite partition of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ since $\theta_Q \geq 0$ and $F_Q \geq 0$ for each Q. Let $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\hat{Q}$ be the one and only CZ cube containing $\hat{x}$. Then for $|\beta| \leq m$, we have

(48) $\partial^\beta F(\hat{x}) = \partial^\beta F_{\hat{Q}}(\hat{x}) + \sum_{Q \in CZ} \partial^\beta \left(\theta_Q \cdot \left(F_Q - F_{\hat{Q}}\right)\right)(\hat{x})$.

A given $Q \in CZ$ enters into the sum in (48) only if $\hat{x} \in \frac{65}{64}Q$; there are at most C such cubes Q, thanks to (34). Moreover, for each $Q \in CZ$ with $\hat{x} \in \frac{65}{64}Q$, we learn from (38) and (46) that

$$\left|\partial^\beta \left(\theta_Q \cdot \left(F_Q - F_{\hat{Q}}\right)\right)(\hat{x})\right| \leq CM\delta_Q^{m-|\beta|} \leq CM \text{ for } |\beta| \leq m, \text{ since } \delta_Q \leq 1.$$

Since also $\left|\partial^\beta F_{\hat{Q}}(\hat{x})\right| \leq CM$ for $|\beta| \leq m$ by (35), (36), it now follows from (48) that $\left|\partial^\beta F(\hat{x})\right| \leq CM$ for all $|\beta| \leq m$. Here, $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is arbitrary. Thus, $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM$.

Next, let $x \in E$. For any $Q \in CZ$ such that $x \in \frac{65}{64}Q$, we have $J_x(F_Q) = P^x$, by (37). Since support $\theta_Q \subset \frac{65}{64}Q$ for each $Q \in CZ$, it follows that $J_x(\theta_Q F_Q) = J_x(\theta_Q) \odot_x P^x$ for each $Q \in CZ$, and consequently,

$$J_x(F) = \sum_{Q \in CZ} J_x(\theta_Q F_Q) = \left[\sum_{Q \in CZ} J_x(\theta_Q)\right] \odot_x P^x = P^x, \text{ by (45)}.$$

Thus, $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM$, $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $J_x(F) = P^x$ for each $x \in E$.

The proof of Lemma 26 is complete. ■

Theorem 11 (Finiteness Principle for Non-negative C^m Interpolation) *There exist constants $k^\#$, C, depending only on m, n, such that the following holds.*

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be finite, and let $f : E \to [0, \infty)$. Let $M_0 > 0$. Suppose that for each $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^\#$, there exists $\vec{P}^S = (P^x)_{x \in S} \in \mathcal{WH}(S)$ such that

- $P^x \in \Gamma_f(x, M_0)$ *for each* $x \in S$, *and*
- $|\partial^\beta (P^x - P^y)(x)| \leq M_0 |x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $x, y \in S$, $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

Then there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

- $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM_0$,
- $F \geq 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n$, *and*
- $F = f$ *on* E.

Proof. Suppose first that $E \subset \frac{1}{2}Q_0$ for a cube Q_0 of sidelength $\delta_{Q_0} = 1$. Pick any $x_0 \in E$. (If E is empty, our theorem holds trivially.)

Let $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$.

Our present hypotheses supply the Whitney field $\vec{P}^S$ required in the hypotheses of Theorem 9.

Hence, recalling Lemma 25 and applying Theorem 9, we obtain

(49) $P^0 \in \Gamma_f(x_0, CM_0)$

and

(50) $F^0 \in C^m(Q_0)$

such that

(51) $J_x(F^0) \in \Gamma_f(x, CM_0)$ for all $x \in E \cap Q_0 = E$

and

(52) $|\partial^\beta(P^0 - F^0)| \leq CM_0$ on Q_0, for $|\beta| \leq m$.

From (1), (2), (49), we have $|\partial^\beta P^0(x_0)| \leq CM_0$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$.

Since P^0 is a polynomial of degree at most $m-1$, and since $x_0 \in E \subset Q_0$ with $\delta_{Q_0} = 1$, it follows that $|\partial^\beta P^0| \leq CM_0$ on Q_0 for $|\beta| \leq m$.

Together with (52), this tells us that

(53) $|\partial^\beta F^0| \leq CM_0$ on Q_0 for $|\beta| \leq m$.

Note that F^0 needn't be nonnegative.

Set $P^x = J_x(F^0)$ for $x \in E$. Then

(54) $P^x \in \Gamma_f(x, CM_0)$ for $x \in E$, and

(55) $\left|\partial^\beta \left(P^x - P^y\right)(x)\right| \leq CM_0 |x-y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x, y \in E$, $|\beta| \leq m-1$.

By Lemma 26, there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

(56) $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM_0$,

(57) $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and

(58) $J_x(F) = P^x$ for each $x \in E$.

From (54) and (2), we have $P^x(x) = f(x)$ for each $x \in E$; hence, (58) implies that

(59) $F(x) = f(x)$ for each $x \in E$.

Our results (56), (57), (59) are the conclusions of our theorem. Thus, we have proven Theorem 11 in the case in which $E \subset \frac{1}{2}Q_0$ with $\delta_{Q_0} = 1$.

To pass to the general case (arbitrary finite $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$), we set up a partition of unity $1 = \sum_\nu \chi_\nu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, where each $\chi_\nu \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\chi_\nu \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\|\chi_\nu\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C$, support $\chi_\nu \subset \frac{1}{2}Q_\nu$, with $\delta_{Q_\nu} = 1$, and with any given point of $\mathbb{R}^n$ belonging to at most C of the Q_ν.

For each ν, we apply the known special case of our theorem to the set $E_\nu = E \cap \frac{1}{2}Q_\nu$ and the function $f_\nu = f|_{E_\nu}$. Thus, we obtain $F_\nu \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with $\|F_\nu\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM_0$, $F_\nu \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $F_\nu = f$ on $E \cap \frac{1}{2}Q_\nu$.

Setting $F = \sum_\nu \chi_\nu F_\nu \in C^m_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we verify easily that $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM_0$, $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $F = f$ on E.

This completes the proof of Theorem 11. ■

Remark *Conversely, we make the following trivial observation: Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be finite, let $f : E \to [0, \infty)$, and let $M_0 > 0$. Suppose $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M_0$, $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $F = f$ on E. Then for each $x \in E$, we have*

- $P^x = J_x(F) \in \Gamma_f(x, M_0)$ *by* (1), (2)*; and*
- $|\partial^\beta(P^x - P^y)(x)| \leq CM_0|x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $x, y \in E$, $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

Therefore, for any $S \subset E$, the Whitney field $\vec{P}^S = (P^x)_{x \in S} \in Wh(S)$ satisfies

- $P^x \in \Gamma_f(x, CM_0)$ *for* $x \in S$, *and*
- $|\partial^\beta(P^x - P^y)(x)| \leq CM_0|x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $x, y \in S$, $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

Note that Theorem 4 (A) follows easily from Theorem 11.

III.4 Computable Convex Sets

In this section, we discuss computational issues regarding the convex set

$$(1)\ \ \Gamma_*(x, M) = \left\{ J_x(F) : F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le M,\ F \ge 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n \right\}.$$

We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by m and n. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences.

We will define convex sets $\tilde{\Gamma}_*(x, M) \subset \mathcal{P}$, prove that

$$(2)\ \ \tilde{\Gamma}_*(x, cM) \subset \Gamma_*(x, M) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}_*(x, CM) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ M > 0,$$

and explain how (in principle) one can compute $\tilde{\Gamma}_*(x, M)$.

We may then use

$$(3)\ \ \tilde{\Gamma}_f(x, M) = \left\{ P \in \tilde{\Gamma}_*(x, M) : P(x) = f(x) \right\}$$

in place of $\Gamma_f(x, M)$ in the statement of Theorem 11. (The assertion in terms of $\tilde{\Gamma}_f$ follows trivially from (2) and the original assertion in terms of Γ_f.)

To achieve (2), we will define

$$(4)\ \ \tilde{\Gamma}_*(x, M) = \left\{ MP(\cdot + x)) : P \in \tilde{\Gamma}_0 \right\}, \text{ for a convex set } \tilde{\Gamma}_0.$$

We will prove that

$$(5)\ \ \Gamma_*(0, c) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}_0 \subset \Gamma_*(0, C).$$

Property (2) then follows at once from (1), (4), and (5).

Thus, our task is to define a convex set $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$ satisfying (5), and explain how (in principle) one can compute $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$.

Recall that $\mathcal{P}$ is the vector space of $(m-1)$-jets. We will work in the space of m-jets. In this section, we let $\mathcal{P}^+$ denote the vector space of real-valued polynomials of degree at most m on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and we write $J_x^+(F)$ to denote the m^{th}-degree Taylor polynomial of F at x, i.e.,

$$J_x^+(F)(y) = \sum_{|\alpha| \le m} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \left(\partial^\alpha F(x)\right) \cdot (y - x)^\alpha.$$

We define

$$(6)\quad \Gamma_0^+ = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} P \in \mathcal{P}^+ : \left|\partial^\beta P(0)\right| \le 1 \text{ for } |\beta| \le m;\ P(x) + |x|^m \ge 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \\ \text{and for every } \epsilon > 0, \text{ there exists } \delta > 0 \text{ such that} \\ P(x) + \epsilon |x|^m \ge 0 \text{ for } |x| \le \delta. \end{array} \right\};$$

Later, we will discuss how Γ_0^+ may be computed in principle.
We next establish the following result.

Lemma 27 *For small enough* c *and large enough* C*, the following hold.*

(A) *If* $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le c$, $F \ge 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, then* $J_0^+(F) \in \Gamma_0^+$.

(B) *If* $P \in \Gamma_0^+$*, then there exists* $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *such that* $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C$, $F \ge 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, and* $J_0^+(F) = P$.

Proof. (A) follows trivially from Taylor's theorem. We prove (B).

Let $P \in \Gamma_0^+$ be given. We introduce cutoff functions $\varphi, \chi \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the following properties.

(7) $\|\chi\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C$, $\chi = 1$ in a neighborhood of 0, $\chi = 0$ outside $B_n(0, 1/2)$, and $0 \le \chi \le 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(8) $\|\varphi\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C$, $\varphi = 1$ for $1/2 \le |x| \le 2$, $\varphi \ge 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$,

and $\varphi(x) = 0$ unless $1/4 < |x| < 4$.

For $k \ge 0$, let

(9) $\varphi_k(x) = \varphi\left(2^k x\right)$ $(x \in \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Thus,

(10) $\|\varphi_k\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le C 2^{mk}$, $\varphi_k \ge 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\varphi_k(x) = 1$ for $2^{-1-k} \le |x| \le 2^{1-k}$, $\varphi_k(x) = 0$ unless $2^{-2-k} \le |x| \le 2^{2-k}$.

Also, for $k \ge 0$, we define a real number b_k as follows.

(11) $b_k = 0$ if $P(x) \ge 0$ for $|x| \le 2^{-k}$; $b_k = -\min\left\{P(x) : |x| \le 2^{-k}\right\}$ otherwise.

Since $P \in \Gamma_0^+$, the b_k satisfy the following:

(12) $0 \le b_k \le 2^{-mk}$ for all $k \ge 0$.

(13) $b_k \cdot 2^{mk} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

By definition of the b_k, we have also for each $k \geq 0$ that

(14) $P(x) + b_k \geq 0$ for $|x| \leq 2^{-k}$.

We define a function $\tilde{F}$ on the closed unit ball $\overline{B_n(0,1)}$ by setting

(15) $\tilde{F}(x) = P(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k \varphi_k(x)$ for $x \in \overline{B_n(0,1)}$.

(The sum contains at most C nonzero terms for any given x.)

We will check that

(16) $\tilde{F} \geq 0$ on $\overline{B_n(0,1)}$.

Indeed, $\tilde{F}(0) = P(0) \geq 0$ since each $\varphi_k(0) = 0$ and $P \in \Gamma_0^+$. For $\hat{x} \in \overline{B_n(0,1)} \setminus \{0\}$ we have $2^{-1-\hat{k}} \leq |\hat{x}| \leq 2^{-\hat{k}}$ for some $\hat{k} \geq 0$.

We then have $\varphi_{\hat{k}}(\hat{x}) = 1$ by (10), hence $P(\hat{x}) + b_{\hat{k}}\varphi_{\hat{k}}(\hat{x}) \geq 0$ by (14). Since also $b_k \varphi_k(\hat{x}) \geq 0$ for all k, it follows that

$$\tilde{F}(\hat{x}) = [P(\hat{x}) + b_{\hat{k}}\varphi_{\hat{k}}(\hat{x})] + \sum_{k \neq \hat{k}} b_k \varphi_k(x) \geq 0,$$

completing the proof of (16).

Next, we check that

(17) $\tilde{F} \in C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)$, $\left\|\tilde{F}\right\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C$, $J_0^+\left(\tilde{F}\right) = P$.

To see this, let

(18) $\tilde{F}_K = P + \sum_{k=0}^{K} b_k \varphi_k$ for $K \geq 0$.

Since $P \in \Gamma_0^+$, we have $\left|\partial^\beta P(0)\right| \leq 1$ for $|\beta| \leq m$, hence

(19) $\|P\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C$.

Also, (10) and (12) give

$$\|b_k \varphi_k\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C \text{ for each } k.$$

Since any given $x \in \overline{B_n(0,1)}$ belongs to at most C of the supports of the φ_k, it follows that

(20) $\left\|\sum_{k=0}^{K} b_k \varphi_k\right\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C.$

From (18), (19), (20), we see that

(21) $\tilde{F}_K \in C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)$ and $\left\|\tilde{F}\right\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C.$

Also, (10) and (18) tell us that

(22) $J_0^+\left(\tilde{F}_K\right) = P$ for each K.

Furthermore for $K_1 < K_2$, (18) gives $\tilde{F}_{K_2} - \tilde{F}_{K_1} = \sum_{K_1<k\leq K_2} b_k \varphi_k$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. From (10) and (13) we see that

$$\max_{K_1<k\leq K_2} \|b_k \varphi_k\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} < \epsilon \text{ if } K_1 \text{ is large enough.}$$

Since any given point lies in support φ_k for at most C distinct k, it follows that

$$\left\|\sum_{K_1<k\leq K_2} b_k \varphi_k\right\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C\epsilon \text{ if } K_2 > K_1 \text{ and } K_1 \text{ is large enough.}$$

Thus, $(\tilde{F}_K)_{K\geq 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C^m(\overline{B_n(0,1)})$. Consequently, $\tilde{F}_K \to \tilde{F}_\infty$ in $C^m(\overline{B_n(0,1)})$-norm for some $\tilde{F}_\infty \in C^m(\overline{B_n(0,1)})$. From (21) and (22), we have

$$\left\|\tilde{F}_\infty\right\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C \text{ and } J_0^+\left(\tilde{F}_\infty\right) = P.$$

On the other hand, comparing (15) to (18), and recalling that any given x belongs to support θ_k for at most C distinct k, we conclude that $\tilde{F}_K \to \tilde{F}$ pointwise as $K \to \infty$.

Since also $\tilde{F}_K \to \tilde{F}_\infty$ pointwise as $K \to \infty$, we have $\tilde{F}_\infty = \tilde{F}$.

Thus, $\tilde{F} \in C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)$, $\left\|\tilde{F}\right\|_{C^m\left(\overline{B_n(0,1)}\right)} \leq C$, and $J_0^+\left(\tilde{F}\right) = P$, completing the proof of (17).

Finally, we recall the cutoff function χ from (7), and define $F = \chi\tilde{F}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

From (16), (17), and the properties (7) of χ, we conclude that $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C$, $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $J_0^+(F) = P$.

Thus, we have established (B).

The proof of Lemma 27 is complete. ■

Now let $\pi : \mathcal{P}^+ \to \mathcal{P}$ denote the natural projection from m-jets at 0 to $(m-1)$-jets at 0, namely, $\pi P = J_0(P)$ for $P \in \mathcal{P}^+$.

We then set $\tilde{\Gamma}_0 = \pi\Gamma_0^+$.

From the above lemma, we learn the following.

(A') Let $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq c$, $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then $J_0(F) \in \tilde{\Gamma}_0$.

(B') Let $P \in \tilde{\Gamma}_0$. Then there exists $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C$, $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $J_0(F) = P$.

Recalling the definition (1), we conclude from (A'), (B') that $\Gamma_*(0, c) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}_0 \subset \Gamma_*(0, C)$.

Thus, our $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$ satisfies the key condition (5).

We discuss briefly how the convex set $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$ may be computed in principle. Recall [19] that a semialgebraic set is a subset of a vector space obtained by taking finitely many unions, intersections, and complements of sets of the form $\{P > 0\}$ for polynomials P. Any subset of a vector space V defined by $E = \{x \in V : \Phi(x) \text{ is true}\}$, where Φ is a formula of first-order predicate calculus (for the theory of real-closed fields) is semialgebraic; moreover, there is an algorithm that accepts Φ as input and exhibits E as a Boolean combination of sets of the form $\{P > 0\}$ for polynomials P. For any given m, n, we see, by inspection of the definitions of Γ_0^+ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$, that $\Gamma_0^+ \subset \mathcal{P}^+$ is defined by a formula of first-order predicate calculus; hence, the same holds for $\tilde{\Gamma}_0 \subset \mathcal{P}$.

Therefore, in principle, we can compute $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$ as a Boolean combination of sets of the form $\{P \in \mathcal{P} : \Pi(P) > 0\}$, where Π is a polynomial on $\mathcal{P}$.

In practice, we make no claim that we know how to compute $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$.

It would be interesting to give a more practical method to compute a convex set satisfying (5).

III.5 Analogues for $C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

So far we have worked with functions in $C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In this section we give the $C^{m-1,1}$-analogues of some our main results.

We note that a given continuous function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ belongs to $C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if its distribution derivatives $\partial^\beta F$ belong to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $|\beta| \leq m$. We may take the norm on $C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to be

$$\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \max_{|\beta|\leq m} \operatorname{ess.sup}_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\partial^\beta F(x)\right|,$$

whereas for $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we have

$$\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \max_{|\beta|\leq m} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\partial^\beta F(x)\right|.$$

Moreover, the derivatives $\partial^\beta F$ of $F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of order $|\beta| \leq m-1$ are continuous. Also, Taylor's theorem holds in the form

$$\left|\partial^\beta F(y) - \sum_{|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq m-1} \frac{1}{\gamma!}\left[\partial^{\gamma+\beta}F(x)\right]\cdot(y-x)^\gamma\right| \leq C\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\cdot|y-x|^{m-|\beta|}$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Similar remarks apply to $C^{m-1,1}(Q)$ and $C^m(Q)$ for cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

Therefore, we may repeat the proofs of Lemmas 25 and 26 in Section III.3, to derive the following results.

Lemma 28 *For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $M > 0$, let*

$$\Gamma'_*(x,M) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} P \in \mathcal{P} : \exists F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ such that} \\ \|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq M, F \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n, J_x(F) = P \end{array} \right\}.$$

Let $f : E \to [0,\infty)$, where $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is finite. For $x \in E$, $M > 0$, let

$$\Gamma'_f(x,M) = \{P \in \Gamma'_*(x,M) : P(x) = f(x)\}.$$

Then $\vec{\Gamma}'_f := (\Gamma'_f(x,M))_{x\in E, M>0}$ is a $(C,1)$-convex shape field, where C depends only on m, n.

Lemma 29 *Let E, f, $\Gamma'_*(x,M)$ be as in Lemma 28, and let $M > 0$, $\vec{P} = (P^x)_{x\in E} \in \mathcal{W}h(E)$. Suppose we have $P^x \in \Gamma'_*(x,M)$ for all $x \in E$, and $\left|\partial^\beta(P^x - P^y)(x)\right| \leq M|x-y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x, y \in E$, $|\beta| \leq m-1$. Then there exists $F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $J_x(F) = P^x$ for all $x \in E$, and $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM$, where C depends only on m, n.*

Similarly, by making small changes in the proof of Theorem 11, we obtain the following result.

Lemma 30 *There exist* $k^{\#}$, C, *depending only on* m, n *for which the following holds.*

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *be finite, let* $f : E \to [0, \infty)$, *and let* $M_0 > 0$. *Suppose that for each* $S \subset E$ *with* $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$ *there exists* $\vec{P}^S = (P^x)_{x \in S} \in \mathcal{W}h(S)$ *such that* $P^x \in \Gamma'_f(x, M_0)$ *for all* $x \in S$, *and* $\left|\partial^\beta (P^x - P^y)\right| \leq M_0 |x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $x, y \in S$, $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

Then there exists $F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *such that* $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM_0$, $F \geq 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n$, *and* $F = f$ *on* E.

In adapting the proof of Theorem 11, we keep the function called F^0 in $C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, but we take the functions called F and F_ν to belong to $C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Now we can easily deduce the following result.

Theorem 12 (Finiteness Principle for Non-negative $C^{m-1,1}$-Interpolation) *There exists constants* $k^{\#}$, C, *depending only on* m, n *for which the following holds.*

Let $f : E \to [0, \infty)$, *with* $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *arbitrary (not necessarily finite). Let* $M_0 > 0$. *Suppose that for each* $S \subset E$ *with* $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$ *there exists* $\vec{P} = (P^x)_{x \in S} \in \mathcal{W}h(S)$ *such that*

- $P^x \in \Gamma'_f(x, M_0)$ *for all* $x \in S$,
- $\left|\partial^\beta (P^x - P^y)(x)\right| \leq M_0 |x - y|^{m-|\beta|}$ *for* $x, y \in S$, $|\beta| \leq m - 1$.

Then there exists $F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *such that*

- $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CM_0$,
- $F \geq 0$, *and*
- $F = f$ *on* E.

Proof. Suppose first that $E \subset Q$ for some cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then by Ascoli's theorem,

$$\left\{F \in C^{m-1,1}(Q) : \|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(Q)} \leq CM_0,\ F \geq 0 \text{ on } Q\right\} \equiv X$$

is compact in the $C^{m-1}(Q)$-norm topology.

For each finite $E_0 \subset E$, Lemma 30 tells us that there exists $F \in X$ such that $F = f$ on E_0.

Consequently, there exists $F \in X$ such that $F = f$ on E. That is,

(1) $F \in C^{m-1,1}(Q)$, $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(Q)} \leq CM_0$, $F \geq 0$ on Q, $F = f$ on E.

We have achieved (1), assuming that $E \subset Q$.

Now suppose $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is arbitrary.

We introduce a partition of unity $1 = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $\theta_\nu \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\theta_\nu \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\|\theta_\nu\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C$, support $\theta_\nu \subset Q_\nu$ for a cube $Q_\nu \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with (say) $\delta_{Q_\nu} = 1$, and such that any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has a neighborhood that intersects at most C of the Q_ν. (Here C depends only on m, n.)

Applying our result (1) to $f|_{E\cap Q_\nu} : E \cap Q_\nu \to [0, \infty)$ for each ν, we obtain functions $F_\nu \in C^{m-1,1}(Q_\nu)$ such that $\|F_\nu\|_{C^{m-1,1}(Q_\nu)} \leq CM_0$, $F_\nu \geq 0$ on Q_ν, $F_\nu = f$ on $E \cap Q_\nu$.

(Here C depends only on m, n.)

We define $F = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu F_\nu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. One checks easily that $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C'M_0$ with C' determined by m, n; $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$; and $F = f$ on E.

This completes the proof of Theorem 12. ■

Note that Theorem 12 easily implies Theorem 4 (B).

As in the case of non-negative C^m-interpolation, we want to replace $\Gamma'_f(x, M)$ by something easier to calculate. In the $C^{m-1,1}$-setting, it is enough to make the following observation.

Define $\tilde{\Gamma}'_0 = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : \left|\partial^\beta P(0)\right| \leq 1$ for $|\beta| \leq m-1$ and $P(x) + |x|^m \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$.

Then

(2) $\Gamma'_*(0, c) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}'_0 \subset \tilde{\Gamma}'_*(0, C)$ with c, C depending only on m, n.

Indeed, the first inclusion in (2) is immediate from the definitions and Taylor's theorem. To prove the second inclusion, we let $P \in \tilde{\Gamma}'_0$ be given, and set $F(x) = \chi(x)(P(x) + |x|^m)$, where χ is a non-negative C^m function with norm at most C_* (depending only on m, n), satisfying $J_0(\chi) = 1$ and support $\chi \subset B_n(0, 1)$.

We then have $F \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C$ (depending only on m, n), $F \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $J_0(F) = P$. Hence, $P \in \Gamma'_*(0, C)$, completing the proof of (2).

This concludes our discussion of interpolation by nonnegative $C^{m-1,1}$ functions.

Next, we present the $C^{m-1,1}$ analogue of the Finiteness Principle for vector-valued functions (Theorem 10).

Theorem 13 (Finiteness Principle for Vector-Valued Functions in $C^{m-1,1}$) *Fix m, n, $D \geq 1$. Then there exist $k^{\#}$, C, determined by m, n, D, such that the following holds.*

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary. For each $x \in E$, let $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed and convex.

Assume that for any $S \subset E$ with $\#(S) \leq k^{\#}$, there exists $F^S \in C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D)$ such that $\left\|F^S\right\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq 1$ and $F^S(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in S$.

Then there exists $F \in C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ such that $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C$ and $F(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in E$.

Proof. We write c, C, C', etc., to denote constants determined by m, n, D. These symbols may denote different constants in different occurrences.

Suppose first that E is finite.

Given F^S as in the above hypothesis, set $\vec{P} = (P^x)_{x \in S}$, with $P^x = J_x\left(F^S\right) \in \mathcal{P}^D$. Then $P^x(x) \in K(x)$ for $x \in S$, $\left|\partial^\beta P^x(x)\right| \leq C$ for $x \in S$, $|\beta| \leq m-1$, and $\left|\partial^\beta\left(P^x - P^y\right)(x)\right| \leq C|x-y|^{m-|\beta|}$ for $x, y \in S$, $|\beta| \leq m-1$.

By Whitney's extension theorem for finite sets, there exists

- $\tilde{F}^S \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ such that
- $\left\|\tilde{F}^S\right\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C$, and

$J_x\left(\tilde{F}^S\right) = P^x$ for $x \in S$; in particular,

- $\tilde{F}^S(x) = F^S(x) \in K(x)$ for $x \in S$.

Thanks to the above bullet points, we have satisfied the hypotheses of the Finiteness Principle for Vector-Valued Functions (Theorem 10). Hence, we obtain $F \in C^m\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right) \subset C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ such that $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C\|F\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C'$, and $F(x) \in K(x)$ for each $x \in E$. Thus, we have proven Theorem 13 in the case of finite E.

Next, suppose E is an arbitrary subset of a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$X = \left\{ F \in C^{m-1,1}\left(Q, \mathbb{R}^D\right) : \|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(Q,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C \right\}$$

is compact in the topology of the $C^{m-1}(Q, \mathbb{R}^D)$-norm, by Ascoli's theorem.

For each $x \in E$, let

$$X(x) = \{F \in X : F(x) \in K(x)\}.$$

Then each $X(x)$ is a closed subset of X, since $K(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is closed. Moreover, given finitely many points $x_1, \cdots, x_N \in E$, we have $X(x_1) \cap \cdots \cap X(x_N) \neq \emptyset$, thanks to Theorem 13 in the known case of finite sets.

Consequently, $\bigcap_{x \in E} X(x) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, there exists $F \in C^{m-1,1}\left(Q, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ such that

(3) $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(Q,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C$ and $F(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in E$.

We have achieved (3) under the assumption $E \subset Q$.

Finally, let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary.

We introduce a partition of unity $1 = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\theta_\nu \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\|\theta\|_{C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C$, $\theta_\nu \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, support $\theta_\nu \subset Q_\nu$ where Q_ν is a cube of sidelength 1, and any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has a neighborhood that meets at most C of the Q_ν. For each ν, the known case of Theorem 13 yields a function $F_\nu \in C^{m-1,1}\left(Q_\nu, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$ with $\|F_\nu\|_{C^{m-1,1}(Q_\nu,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C$ and $F_\nu(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in E \cap Q_\nu$.

We set $F = \sum_\nu \theta_\nu F_\nu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. One checks easily that $F \in C^{m-1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^D\right)$, $\|F\|_{C^{m-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^D)} \leq C$, and $F(x) \in K(x)$ for all $x \in E$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 13. ■

References

[1] Edward Bierstone and Pierre D. Milman. C^m-norms on finite sets and C^m extension criteria. *Duke Math. J.*, 137(1):1–18, 2007.

[2] Edward Bierstone, Pierre D. Milman, and Wiesław Pawłucki. Differentiable functions defined in closed sets. A problem of Whitney. *Invent. Math.*, 151(2):329–352, 2003.

[3] Edward Bierstone, Pierre D. Milman, and Wiesław Pawłucki. Higher-order tangents and Fefferman's paper on Whitney's extension problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 164(1):361–370, 2006.

[4] Yuri Brudnyi and Pavel Shvartsman. A linear extension operator for a space of smooth functions defined on a closed subset in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 280(2):268–272, 1985.

[5] Yuri Brudnyi and Pavel Shvartsman. The traces of differentiable functions to subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Linear and complex analysis. Problem book 3. Part II*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1574, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994, 279–281.

[6] Yuri Brudnyi and Pavel Shvartsman. Generalizations of Whitney's extension theorem. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (3):129 ff., approx. 11 pp. (electronic), 1994.

[7] Yuri Brudnyi and Pavel Shvartsman. The Whitney problem of existence of a linear extension operator. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 7(4):515–574, 1997.

[8] Yuri Brudnyi and Pavel Shvartsman. The trace of jet space $\mathrm{J}^k\Lambda^\omega$ to an arbitrary closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 350(4):1519–1553, 1998.

[9] Yuri Brudnyi and Pavel Shvartsman. Whitney's extension problem for multivariate $\mathrm{C}^{1,\omega}$-functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(6):2487–2512 (electronic), 2001.

[10] Charles Fefferman. A sharp form of Whitney's extension theorem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(1):509–577, 2005.

[11] Charles Fefferman. A generalized sharp Whitney theorem for jets. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 21(2):577–688, 2005.

[12] Charles Fefferman. Whitney's extension problem for C^m. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 164(1):313–359, 2006.

[13] Charles Fefferman. C^m extension by linear operators. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 166(3):779–835, 2007.

[14] Charles Fefferman. Whitney's extension problems and interpolation of data. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 46(2):207–220, 2009.

[15] Charles Fefferman and Bo'az Klartag. Fitting a C^m-smooth function to data. I. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 169(1):315–346, 2009.

[16] Charles Fefferman and Bo'az Klartag. Fitting a C^m-smooth function to data. II. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 25(1):49–273, 2009.

[17] Charles Fefferman and Garving K. Luli. The Brenner-Hochster-Kollár and Whitney problems for vector-valued functions and jets. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 30(3):875–892, 2014.

[18] Georges Glaeser. Étude de quelques algèbres tayloriennes. *J. Analyse Math.*, 6:1–124; erratum, insert to 6 (1958), no. 2, 1958.

[19] Lars Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. III.* Classics in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin, 2007. Pseudo-differential operators, Reprint of the 1994 edition.

[20] Erwan Le Gruyer. Minimal Lipschitz extensions to differentiable functions defined on a Hilbert space. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(4):1101–1118, 2009.

[21] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997. Reprint of the 1970 original, Princeton Paperbacks.

[22] Pavel Shvartsman. The traces of functions of two variables satisfying to the Zygmund condition. In *Studies in the Theory of Functions of Several Real Variables, (Russian)*, pages 145–168. Yaroslav. Gos. Univ., Yaroslavl, 1982.

[23] Pavel Shvartsman. Lipschitz sections of set-valued mappings and traces of functions from the Zygmund class on an arbitrary compactum. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 276(3):559–562, 1984.

[24] Pavel Shvartsman. Lipschitz sections of multivalued mappings. In *Studies in the theory of functions of several real variables (Russian)*, pages 121–132, 149. Yaroslav. Gos. Univ., Yaroslavl, 1986.

[25] Pavel Shvartsman. Traces of functions of Zygmund class. *(Russian) Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, (5):203–215, 1987. English transl. in *Siberian Math. J.* 28 (1987), 853–863.

[26] Pavel Shvartsman. K-functionals of weighted Lipschitz spaces and Lipschitz selections of multivalued mappings. In *Interpolation spaces and related topics*, (Haifa, 1990), 245–268, Israel Math. Conf. Proc., 5, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1992.

[27] Pavel Shvartsman. On Lipschitz selections of affine-set valued mappings. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 11(4):840–868, 2001.

[28] Pavel Shvartsman. Lipschitz selections of set-valued mappings and Helly's theorem. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 12(2):289–324, 2002.

[29] Pavel Shvartsman. Barycentric selectors and a Steiner-type point of a convex body in a Banach space. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 210(1):1–42, 2004.

[30] Pavel Shvartsman. The Whitney extension problem and Lipschitz selections of set-valued mappings in jet-spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360(10):5529–5550, 2008.

[31] John C. Wells. Differentiable functions on Banach spaces with Lipschitz derivatives. *J. Differential Geometry*, 8:135–152, 1973.

[32] Hassler Whitney. Analytic extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 36(1):63–89, 1934.

[33] Nahum Zobin. Whitney's problem on extendability of functions and an intrinsic metric. *Advances in Math.*, 133(1):96–132, 1998.

[34] Nahum Zobin. Extension of smooth functions from finitely connected planar domains. *Journal of Geom. Analysis*, 9(3):489–509, 1999.

Charles Fefferman
Affiliation: Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Fine Hall Washington Road, Princeton, New Jersey, 08544, USA
Email: cf@math.princeton.edu

Arie Israel
Affiliation: The University of Texas at Austin, Department of Mathematics, 2515 Speedway Stop C1200, Austin, Texas, 78712-1202, USA
Email: arie@math.utexas.edu

Garving K. Luli
Affiliation: Department of Mathematics, University of California, Davis, One Shields Ave, Davis, California, 95616, USA
Email: kluli@@math.ucdavis.edu